DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 669 EA 028 776

TITLE	U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998-2002.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-09-30
NOTE	160p.; For only prior department strategic plan (in 1994), see ED 381 565.
AVAILABLE FROM	World Wide Web: http://www.ed.goc/pubs/StratPln98/
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Assessment; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; *Institutional Mission; Performance; Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation; *Strategic Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Education

ABSTRACT

After assessing national progress toward the 1990 National Education Goals, President Clinton announced his "Call to Action for American Education" in February 1997, which identified critical areas where work was still needed. The Department of Education (ED) developed seven priorities to help focus its efforts. The priorities are: read independently by the end of the third grade; master challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry, by the end of the eighth grade; be prepared for and able to afford at least two years of college by age 18, and be able to pursue lifelong learning as adults; have a talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in the classroom; have their classroom connected to the Internet by the year 2000 and be technologically literate; learn in strong, safe, and drug-free schools; and learn according to challenging and clear standards of achievement and accountability. This report presents the Department of Education's 5-year strategic plan, which describes how the Department of Education will work to improve education for all children and adults in the United States. The department established the following four goals: (1) Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment; (2) build a solid foundation for learning for all children; (3) ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning; and (4) make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction. The President's Call to Action priorities are included in the plan as objectives. Under each goal, the plan identifies several objectives supported by core strategies and performance indicators. The introduction describes the department's mission, accomplishments, and plans. Other sections describe the resources needed, the relationship of strategic-plan goals and objectives to program goals, key external factors that could affect achievement of ED's goals and objectives, findings of program evaluations and other studies, and the development of the plan. Three tables are included. Appendices contain supplemental information on performance indicators and descriptions of program evaluations and other studies. (LMI)

ED 413 669

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U.S. Department of Education

Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

September 30, 1997

The Department of Education's Mission

To ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 028 776

U.S. Department of Education

Strategic Plan, 1998-2002

September 30, 1997

The Department of Education's Mission

To ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

Preface

The American people consistently rank education among their top national priorities. A sound education is widely recognized as essential to securing a good job and becoming a responsible and contributing citizen. National goals were set in 1990 to focus the efforts of governments, educators, and parents and communities on education reforms to ensure that all children achieve to high education standards and obtain the necessary skills for achievement as adults.

In response, states and local communities, as well as the Department of Education, implemented programs and initiatives supporting education reform. After taking stock of national progress toward the goals, President Clinton announced his "Call to Action for American Education" in February 1997. The Call to Action identified critical areas where work was still needed; the Department has developed seven priorities to help focus our efforts on accomplishing the goals.

As required by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, the Department has now prepared a strategic plan for 1998–2002. This plan reflects the Department's seven priorities and integrates them with our mission and program authorities. The strategic plan will help us direct our resources, strengthen coordination within the Department and across federal agencies, eliminate duplication of programs and services, use technology to perform our work more efficiently and accurately, and communicate more effectively with those we serve and our partners in the education enterprise. The strategic plan is not a static document—it will change in response to feedback from stakeholders and customers, assessment of our performance, emerging national needs, and new legislation.

Although not required under the 1993 Results Act, performance indicators are included in this plan. Using the indicators will hold us accountable for results, and we are fully committed to implementing a comprehensive performance measurement system throughout the Department. We will use the strategic plan as a basis for reporting to Congress and the public on our progress. In doing so, we hope to demonstrate to the taxpayers that our nation's resources are being invested and managed wisely in order to achieve educational excellence.

As we prepare for a new century, the Department of Education is working with states and schools to adopt new and more effective strategies for teaching and learning. Similarly, the Department must adopt better ways of working in order to better meet the needs of families, students, communities, schools, and states. This document sets forth our goals for improvement and our plans for meeting them.

Richard W. Riley
Secretary of Education

Marshall S. Smith
Acting Deputy Secretary of Education

The U.S. Department of Education's Seven Priorities

February 1997

All students should be able to:

1. **Read independently by the end of the third grade.**

2. **Master challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry, by the end of the eighth grade.**

3. **Be prepared for and able to afford at least two years of college by age 18, and be able to pursue lifelong learning as adults.**

4. **Have a talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in their classroom.**

5. **Have their classroom connected to the Internet by the year 2000 and be technologically literate.**

6. **Learn in strong, safe, and drug-free schools.**

7. **Learn according to challenging and clear standards of achievement and accountability.**

Contents

Preface 3

Introduction 9

Framework of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives 14

Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. 15
Objective 1.1: States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects. 17
Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all. 18
Objective 1.3: Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free. 19
Objective 1.4: A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America. 20
Objective 1.5: Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts. 21
Objective 1.6: Greater public school choice will be available to students and families. 22
Objective 1.7: Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education. 23

Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children. 25
Objective 2.1: All children enter school ready to learn. 27
Objective 2.2: Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade. 28
Objective 2.3: Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry. 29
Objective 2.4: Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards. 30

Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning. 33
Objective 3.1: Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education. 35
Objective 3.2: Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program. 36
Objective 3.3: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive. 37
Objective 3.4: Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning. 39

Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction. 43
Objective 4.1: Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products. 45
Objective 4.2: Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results. 46
Objective 4.3: An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity. 48

Contents, continued

Objective 4.4: Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency. 49
Objective 4.5: The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing. 50
Objective 4.6: Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity. 51
Objective 4.7: All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven. 52

Resources 53

Relationship of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives to Program Goals 56

Key External Factors that Could Affect Achievement of ED's Goals and Objectives 61

Program Evaluations and Other Studies 63

Development of the Plan 66

Appendix A: Supplemental Information on Performance Indicators 71

Appendix B: Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies 97
Elementary and Secondary Education Program Evaluations 99
Postsecondary, Vocational, School-to-Work, and Adult Program Evaluations 102
National Statistical and Assessment Studies 107
Grantee Reporting Systems 113
Other Surveys and Studies 114

Facts about the Department of Education

- *The Department of Education (ED) is the smallest federal department, with less than 5,000 staff.* Our full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing ceiling in FY 1997 is 4,613.

- *The number of programs administered in FY 1997 was 197.*

- *We provided or oversaw $67.6 billion in aid to education in FY 1997.* This figure includes program funding, new student loans, and federal administration. It breaks down as follows:

  - *Congressional appropriations for program activities: $32.0 billion.* These funds are used for grants to state and local agencies, higher education institutions, and other entities; contracts; and subsidies for direct and guaranteed student loans.

  - *New student loans: $34.7 billion.* Postsecondary education student loans are made by ED or guaranteed by ED and issued by banks and other financial institutions.

  - *Federal administration: $807.7 million.* Department of Education salaries and expenses totaled 1.2% of the FY 1997 dollars for aid to education.

- *We are responsible for a portfolio of outstanding student loans that totaled about $131 billion in FY 1997.*

- *Federal funds from all federal agencies represent a small but important proportion of K-12 education funding and postsecondary general institutional funding, but provide or guarantee a very large share of student financial aid.* In 1994–95, federal education funds represented–
  - 8.7% of all education funding (public and private).
  - 6.3% of K-12 funding (public and private).
  - 12.3% of funding for postsecondary institutions (excluding student financial aid).
  - 74.7% of all student financial aid awarded to postsecondary students.

Introduction

Mission and Key Functions

The Department of Education's mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation. We promote educational excellence for all students by providing financial support to states and local agencies in areas of national priority, promoting challenging standards, getting families and communities involved in schools, providing information on the best educational practices, ensuring that postsecondary education is affordable, and providing high-quality statistics and evaluations on federal programs.

At the same time, we have a special obligation to ensure that all students have the opportunity to achieve to the challenging standards of educational excellence. This commitment often requires that we focus our resources and activities on students who risk educational failure due to the disadvantages they face. The Department of Education is determined to help students from all backgrounds—regardless of race, national origin, color, disability, age, or gender—to achieve excellence under the American educational system. Where this plan states that "all" students are a focus of a particular objective, it means just that.

To carry out our mission, the Department works in partnership with states, schools, communities, institutions of higher education, and financial institutions—and through them with students, teachers and professors, families, administrators, and employers. Key functions of the agency are as follows:

- Leadership to address critical issues in American education.
- Grants to education agencies and institutions to strengthen teaching and learning and prepare students for citizenship, employment in a changing economy, and lifelong learning.
- Student loans and grants to help pay for the costs of postsecondary education.
- Grants for literacy, employment, and self-sufficiency training for adults.
- Monitoring and enforcement of civil rights to ensure nondiscrimination by recipients of federal education funds.
- Support for statistics, research, development, evaluation, and dissemination of information to improve educational quality and effectiveness.

Prior Strategic Plan

In December 1994 the U.S. Department of Education released its first-ever strategic plan, a working document that served as the forerunner to the current proposed plan. This first plan was widely distributed, both internally to every Department employee and externally to Congress, stakeholder groups, educators, and others interested in the Department's goals and operations. The Department has used the plan to improve its programs and operations and to help employees understand the Department's goals and the importance of their contributions to those goals. That plan reflected priorities and accomplishments described below.

Accomplishments: Legislative Reforms

In partnership with the Congress and the Administration, historic legislative achievements have provided the Department with a more coherent set of laws.

- The *Balanced Budget Act of 1997* and the *Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997* provide the largest investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill. HOPE Scholarships should help make two years of postsecondary education as universal as high school is today, and tax deductions will support lifelong

learning. In addition, new education savings accounts and expanded use of IRAs for education will help families save and pay for college.

- The new *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997* improves basic academics, increases parental involvement, and moves federal dollars to the classroom. Students with disabilities will now be expected, to the maximum extent possible, to meet the same high educational expectations that have been set for all students by states and local schools.

- Elementary and secondary education reforms, including the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994)* and *Improving America's Schools Act (1994),* promote challenging education standards for all children, safe and disciplined schools, effective teaching practices, expanded technology, charter schools, and stronger family involvement.

- *The School-to-Work Opportunities Act (1994)* is helping communities and states put in place high-quality systems of academic and occupational education linking schools with postsecondary institutions and employers.

- The *Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act (1994)* restructured the Department's research office and set new priorities for dissemination and improvement activities.

- The *Student Loan Reform Act (1993)* helped make the college student aid system more efficient by authorizing a new Direct Student Loan Program that is giving postsecondary institutions and students expanded choice among alternative aid providers and offering streamlined aid.

Accomplishments: Streamlining the Agency

An increasingly streamlined Department of Education is more cost-efficient in providing education support and services.

- *Fewer separate programs.* Since 1992, the Department has worked with Congress to eliminate 64 programs totaling more than $700 million.

- *Fewer staff/higher productivity.* The Department's full-time equivalent staffing level (FTE) in 1997 was 4,613, a decrease of 6% from the 1992 FTE level of 4,927. During the same period, the Department's discretionary budget increased overall by $3.7 billion, a 16% increase.

- *Total reinvention of our regulations.* To date, the Department has eliminated, reinvented, or simplified almost every regulation on the books in FY 1995—with 94% affected and 36% completely eliminated. More than 2,000 pages of regulations were eliminated, reinvented, or simplified.

- *Paperwork burden reduced.* In response to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, our paperwork burden was trimmed by 10% during FY 1996, translating into 5.4 million fewer hours for schools, students, parents, states, and other customers to complete required forms. In FY 1997 we are using new technologies for collecting and exchanging information to further reduce paperwork burden on our customers.

- *One-stop shopping for information on student loans and grants.* The Department's world wide web page receives 5 million hits each month, and our toll-free 1-800-USA-LEARN number provides 5,000 callers a week with access to comprehensive information about Department publications and programs.

Accomplishments: Improved Performance

A more effective Department of Education can better serve the public.

- *Efficient loan collections.*
  - Default rates for student loans have been cut by more than half, from 22.4% for loans entering repayment in 1990 to 15.0% in 1992 to 10.7% for 1994, the most recent year available.
  - Collections on defaulted student loans from all sources increased from $1.1 billion in FY 1992 to $2.4 billion in FY 1996.

- *Serving student aid customers well.*
  - Since the start of the Direct Loan program in 1993, over $18 billion has been loaned to students. The Direct Loan program cuts out middlemen and makes loans directly to students, improving service to students and saving the government money. In 1996, 83% of participating institutions reported they were satisfied or very satisfied.
  - The customer satisfaction level for the Federal Family Education Loan program, which works through lenders such as banks, increased from 68% in 1994-95 to 79% in 1995-96. This may be due partially to the beneficial competition of the Direct Loan program.

- *Ensuring that taxpayers and students get their money's worth.* As a result of tougher Department oversight, 875 postsecondary institutions have lost their eligibility to participate in student financial aid programs. Of this number, 672 cannot participate in any aid program and 203 cannot participate in loan programs.

- *Well-focused research and statistics.* A strengthened research and statistical office is providing more timely and useful information on the condition of the American education system and on research-based improvements.

- *Performance indicators.* Performance measurement supported through program evaluations, national assessments, and grantee reporting systems is increasingly providing the Department with important information to gauge performance and guide improvement.

- *New employee-management partnership.* A strengthened Labor-Management Partnership is helping all employees to work together to achieve better results while enabling the Department to win the National Partnership Award in 1996 and the Office of Personnel Management's Family-Friendly Work-Place Award in 1997.

Accomplishments: Partnerships

A Department with strengthened partnerships is better able to achieve national educational priorities.

- *Flexibility for states.*
  - Over 200 waivers have been granted to communities to provide greater flexibility in exchange for increased accountability for results under the first time ever waiver authorities in Goals 2000, School-to-Work and the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
  - Twelve states have been granted broad authority under Ed-Flex to waive a range of federal statutory or regulatory requirements in exchange for increased accountability for student progress.
  - As of 1997, 49 states have submitted consolidated program plans covering several Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs and federal vocational education grants, instead of separate plans for each program.

- *Partnerships for families and communities.*
  - More than 3,000 organizations now participate in the "Partnership for Family Involvement in Education." The partnership brings together schools, families, communities, religious organizations, and employers to work together to support learning.
  - READ*WRITE*NOW, a grassroots community literacy initiative that links tutors with children who need help learning to read, has grown from serving 500,000 children in 1994 to 1.5 million in 1997.

Strategic Plan Goals and Indicators

This strategic plan sets out four goals for the U.S. Department of Education:

1. *Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.*
2. *Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.*
3. *Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.*
4. *Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.*

These are ambitious goals that reflect areas in which the Department can influence outcomes, even where we do not have direct control. Our plan identifies areas of national need as goals and objectives and sets strategies for the federal government to help meet those needs. At the same time, the plan ensures that in areas where we have direct control—management of our programs, data systems, and workforce—we are as efficient and effective as possible.

Under each goal, the plan identifies several objectives, supported by core strategies and performance indicators. The core strategies comprise key programs, special initiatives, and specific actions that the Department is pursuing to achieve each objective. The performance indicators ensure accountability for results and will provide feedback needed to adjust and improve our operations. The plan includes a mix of outcome and intermediate indicators that we will use during the next five years to judge our progress and document results.

- Outcome indicators tell us whether progress is being made in areas of national need and in the specific goals for our programs. For example, are more children learning to read and complete challenging mathematics? Are school-to-work system graduates able to move smoothly into employment or further education? Are more Americans able to enroll in and complete postsecondary education?

- Intermediate indicators tell us whether our strategies are working and our programs and processes are on track. For example, are new programs reaching the anticipated number of students and states? Is the Department meeting major milestones and deadlines necessary to achieving the goals and objectives?

Next Steps: Communication, Alignment, and Implementation

Communication. Once completed, the Department's plan will be given to all employees in hard copy, as well as featured on the ED website (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/StratPln98/). We will also send it to chief state school officers and national associations that work with us on educational reform and improvement. The Deputy Secretary will hold sessions with individual offices to discuss how the plan affects their programs and services, as well as work with the Department's Labor-Management Partnership Council to ensure that every employee understands how their work contributes to achieving the plan's goals and objectives.

Alignment. During fall 1997, and as needed thereafter, key agency documents will be aligned with the strategic plan. These documents include our annual plan (individual program performance plans for about 90 activities in the agency), budget justifications, implementation plans for the Department's seven priority initiatives (cross-cutting plans that involve leadership and program activities), and evaluation plans.

Implementation. Reporting on progress—accomplishments and barriers—will start immediately with the publication of this plan. "Objective leaders"—senior officers responsible for the individual objectives—will report to the Deputy Secretary and senior officers periodically. Also, staff and program offices will work jointly on reviewing progress under the individual program performance plans, which represent major activities and resources for accomplishing the plan's goals. Finally, we will implement analytic agendas for the strategic plan objectives to improve the information base and support implementation of the strategies.

U.S. Department of Education
Framework of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives

Mission: To ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation.

Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.	Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.	Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.	Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.
Objectives	**Objectives**	**Objectives**	**Objectives**
1.1 States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.	2.1 All children enter school ready to learn.	3.1 Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.	4.1 Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.
1.2 Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.	2.2 Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.	3.2 Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.	4.2 Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.
1.3 Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.	2.3 Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.	3.3 Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.	4.3 An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.
1.4 A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.	2.4 Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.	3.4 Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.	4.4 Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.
1.5 Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts.			4.5 The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing.
1.6. Greater public school choice will be available to students and families.			4.6 Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.
1.7 Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.			4.7 All levels of the agency are fully performance driven.

Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Key Outcome Indicators for Elementary and Secondary Education

(These indicators are cross-cutting and apply to many or all objectives in Goals 1 and 2).

1. *Increasing percentages of all students will meet or exceed basic, proficient, and advanced performance levels in national and state assessments of reading, math, and other core subjects.*

2. *Students in high-poverty schools will show continuous improvement in achieving proficiency levels comparable to those for the nation.*

3. *High school attendance and graduation rates will continually improve—particularly in high-poverty schools and among students with disabilities and others at risk of school failure.*

4. *The proportion of high school graduates, including vocational concentrators, who complete at least three years of science and three years of math will increase 10% between 1996 and 2000.*

5. *Increasing numbers of high school students will successfully complete advanced placement courses each year.*

6. *Students in high-poverty schools will show comparable increases in completion of challenging course work—including advanced placement courses—that will enable them to pursue higher education or other options.*

7. *Increasing percentages of high school graduates will successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.*

The federal government has an important but limited role to play in education reform. Federal support seeks to help states and local communities strengthen schools and improve the educational performance for all children, so that the nation can meet the economic and social challenges of the 21st century.

The key to improving student performance is comprehensive and sustained education reform. States and communities—not the federal government—are developing and implementing challenging academic standards for every child to meet, to ensure that all children know that their schools and communities have high expectations for their academic performance. To further support student academic success, state school-to-work systems place learning in the meaningful context of the world of work and encourage students to prepare for postsecondary education and high-skill employment.

An environment conducive to learning is also important. To learn, students must have schools that are safe and orderly and promote positive values. Essential to high-quality learning are talented and

dedicated teachers. In addition, teachers and students need access to advanced technology that assists instruction and helps students develop skills they will need for work and further education.

To achieve effective education reform that meets the needs of all students, everyone must be involved—students; parents; educational leaders at the school, district, and state levels; community members, businesses, and religious groups; and government at all levels.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 1

- In formulating Goal 1, the Department relied heavily on the findings from major research studies, national assessments, and evaluations of elementary and secondary programs and continues to be informed by ongoing studies. Studies of effective reforms documented the need to take a systemic approach to aligning all elements of schooling with challenging standards for student performance. Evaluations of programs prior to reauthorization helped identify areas that required major overhaul in Title I and other federal elementary and secondary programs to support whole school improvement in teaching and learning.

  - Evaluations of the Title I program for disadvantaged students found that the antecedent program, operating in isolation from state and local improvement efforts, was too weak an intervention to help close the learning gap. These evaluations influenced legislation such as the Improving America's Schools Act and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

  - The need for standards has been documented especially through international studies (the Third International Mathematics and Science Study) and national assessments such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress that showed mediocre overall achievement and uneven performance of U.S. students in different states and communities.

  - A number of studies also identified considerable complacency on the part of students and parents about their performance. Some of the studies suggested that parents cannot rely on student grades to inform them on how well their children are doing. An "A" in a high-poverty school might equal a "C" in a low-poverty school when measured against an external standard.

  - Recent studies on drug prevention programs have pointed to the need to strengthen the research base on effective strategies and their use in schools.

- Early findings from the evaluation of the implementation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act indicated that states have begun building school-to-work systems but have not necessarily imbedded their efforts within general school reform.

Objective 1.1: States develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.

Performance Indicators

8. *By the end of the 1997-98 school year, all states will have challenging content and performance standards in place for two or more core subjects.*
9. *By 2001 all states will have assessments aligned to challenging content and performance standards for two or more core subjects.*
10. *By 2002 increasing percentages of the general public and parents will be aware of the importance of challenging academic standards for all children, including at least the majority of parents from low-income families.*

Support for standards-based reform has deepened over the past six years and is now part of almost all state plans for education reform. The support for standards that came initially from subject matter experts and professional associations has broadened to include state policymakers, business leaders, and community coalitions. Even so, considerable work needs to be done to move from understanding standards to implementing them in the classroom.

Changing instruction and curricula will require even greater effort over the next five years than meeting the original challenge of developing support for the concept of standards. Survey results and other sources indicate that developing assessments and related student performance standards, improving professional development programs, and linking accountability to school and student performance may be the most effective policy levers for the Department. The federal government can assist by providing support and guidance on challenging standards and assessments, and by offering highly focused, voluntary national tests that can serve as benchmarks for parents and communities.

Core Strategies

- **Support for development of standards and assessments.** Provide financial support to states to develop and implement clear, challenging academic standards and aligned assessments in ways that promote excellence and equity—through the Goals 2000: Educate America Act; Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs such as Title I Aid for Disadvantaged Children; Eisenhower Professional Development program; Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education and Applied Technology Education Act; and other federal programs designed to help all students achieve to high academic standards.
- **Technical assistance and information sharing**. Use the Department's comprehensive technical assistance centers, regional education laboratories, research and development centers, and new, cross-cutting Department monitoring teams (integrated review teams) to assist states and school districts in implementing challenging academic standards and aligned assessments.
- **Public awareness and community engagement**. Conduct a national campaign of awareness and community engagement to increase public understanding and support for challenging academic standards and the national assessments in reading and math.
- **Federal programs that support standards**.
  - Implement federal program requirements calling for the adoption of state standards.
  - For Title I, provide technical assistance, guidance, and models of quality standards and their effective implementation to support the efforts of states to link Title I and other federally-supported programs to state standards.
  - Help guide the development of assessments that make appropriate accommodations for students with limited English proficiency or disabilities.

Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.

Performance Indicators

11. *Increasing percentages of high school graduates from school-to-work systems or from vocational concentrations will successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.*
12. *Increasing percentages of employers will be highly satisfied with the productivity and work-readiness skills of graduates from school-to-work systems or vocational concentrations.*
13. *By fall 2000, the percentage of high school students passing industry-recognized tests on technical skills will increase by at least 10%.*
14. *Two million youth will be engaged actively in school-to-work systems by fall 2000.*
15. *By 2000 an increasing percentage of secondary schools will provide opportunities for students to achieve industry-recognized skill standards.*
16. *Thirty percent of high schools will have key school-to-work system components in place by fall 2000.*
17. *All youths with disabilities age 14 and older will have IEPs that include a statement of transition service needs that will help focus on courses of study.*

Researchers, educators, employers, and policymakers have sought ways to make education relevant to students' future careers, adapt instruction to the ways in which students learn best, and ensure that students learn the habits and skills that employers value. By adding meaningful context from the world of work, educators hope to engage the interest and intellect of students and help them learn more effectively. Whether learning by doing and in context is accomplished at school or in a work setting, school-to-work systems (STW) seek to improve career prospects and academic achievement in high school—and thereby boost enrollment in postsecondary education and increase the likelihood of obtaining high-skill, high-wage employment.

Core Strategies

- **Financial support for STW systems.** Help build comprehensive school-to-work systems in every state by providing grants under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and by supporting high-quality technical training through vocational education and tech-prep education.
- **Interagency and interoffice collaboration.** Continue to work with the Department of Labor to administer the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; and align grant-making, monitoring, and technical assistance, financial audit, performance reporting, and other key processes in the school-to-work initiative with those in related education programs in both departments.
- **System improvement.** Assist implementation and improve the quality of school-to-work systems through technical assistance, identification of promising practices, and evaluation of states' progress.
- **Involvement of schools, colleges, and employers in building school-to-work systems and stronger vocational education programs.**
  - Engage high schools, postsecondary institutions, and adult high schools by sponsoring a national information center; creating networks that include educators, employers, and other key stakeholder groups; and sponsoring efforts to align postsecondary admissions policies with new methods of assessing high school student performance.
  - Build strong employer participation in school-to-work by targeting outreach activities at employers and their organizations and by collaborating with the National Employer Leadership Council.
- **Professional development.**
  - Prepare teachers to fully participate in school-to-work by helping colleges of education to incorporate school-to-work elements in their curricula.
  - Support teacher training efforts aimed at improving the skills of teachers in using contextual learning approaches to instruction of basic and technical skills.

Objective 1.3: Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.

Performance Indicators

18. *Recent increasing rates of alcohol and drug use (alcohol, marijuana, tobacco) among school-age children will slow and begin to fall by 2000.*
19. *Rates of alcohol and drug use in schools will slow and begin to fall by 2000.*
20. *The number of criminal and violent incidents in schools by students will continually decrease between now and 2002.*
21. *The percentage of students reporting tolerant attitudes toward drug and alcohol use will decline significantly between now and 2002.*
22. *By 1999 all local educational agencies participating in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program will use prevention programs based on the Department's principles of effectiveness.*
23. *By 1999 all states will conduct periodic statewide surveys or collect statewide data on alcohol and drug use of students and incidents of crime and violence in schools.*
24. *The percentage of teachers who are trained to deal with discipline problems in the classroom will increase significantly by 2000.*

After more than a decade of declines, illegal drug use by American youth has increased significantly. Youth attitudes toward drug use, which are a strong predictor of changes in actual drug use, continue to show tolerance toward drug use. Rates of interpersonal violence are unacceptably high, and serious violent activity in and around schools appears to be escalating. Although the federal government has provided support to schools to help them develop and implement drug prevention activities, these efforts have not been universally successful. Definitive research findings about effective school-based practices have been slow to emerge. Indeed, a recent longitudinal study of 19 school districts found that although some drug prevention programs in these districts improved student outcomes, the effects were small. Moreover, the study found that few schools employed program approaches that have been found effective in previous research, and that program delivery was inconsistent.

Core Strategies

- **Promotion of effective approaches.**
  - Implement principles of effectiveness for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to focus support on promising practices and use of sound information for program improvement.
  - Through research and evaluation, identify effective violence and drug prevention programming.
  - Disseminate effective programs and strategies through technical assistance and training, conferences, publications, and use of technology.
  - Provide teacher training under programs such as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Professional Development program to improve teachers' skills in reducing conflict.
- **Financial support.** Continue to fund states and local school districts under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act program, while working to improve the quality of local activities.
- **Public attitudes**. Help youth and parents understand the harmful nature of drug use by participating in or conducting media campaigns and other dissemination activities, in conjunction with other agencies.
- **Prohibiting drug and alcohol use.** The Department will encourage state efforts to support existing local policies prohibiting drug and alcohol use in schools (97% of schools and districts have such policies) and also their efforts to cover all schools with such policies.
- **Improved data systems.** Improve the capacity of states and school districts to collect and analyze information on alcohol and drug use and violent behavior.
- **Interagency coordination**. Work with other federal agencies—including the Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation; the President's Crime Prevention Council; and the Office of National Drug Control Policy—to coordinate strategies to reduce drug and alcohol use and violence.

Objective 1.4: A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.

Performance Indicators

25. *The percentage of teachers and principals across the nation who are rated by supervisors, parents, and peers as very effective will increase annually.*
26. *Throughout the nation the percentage of secondary school teachers who have at least a minor in the subject they teach will increase annually.*
27. *The percentage of qualified new teachers who leave the profession within the first 3 years will continuously decrease.*
28. *The number of nationally board certified teachers will increase to reach 105,000 by 2006.*
29. *By 2002, 75% of states will align initial teacher certification standards with high content and student performance standards.*

A talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teaching force is one of the most important ingredients for education reform. Research indicates that teachers' knowledge and skill make a crucial difference in what students learn. Research also demonstrates the value of intensive and sustained high-quality professional development when developing skills in new models of teaching and learning. The current teaching force needs high-quality professional development if all teachers are to be able to teach a diverse student population to challenging standards. Further, new teachers must be well prepared to help diverse learners master challenging content and performance standards. It is estimated that about one-fourth of newly hired teachers lack the qualifications for their jobs. There is also high turnover in beginning teachers—22% of beginning teachers drop out of the teaching profession within the first three years. Key reasons include lack of support and typical "sink or swim" approaches to induction.

Core Strategies

- **Improving the quality and retention of new teachers.**
  - Support programs to recruit talented people from all backgrounds into teaching.
  - Improve the quality of teacher education for new teachers.
  - Encourage and support special efforts to retain new teachers.
  - Support career ladders that will enable bilingual paraprofessionals to become certified teachers.
- **Financial support and interagency coordination.** Provide funds to states and schools through the Eisenhower and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) professional development programs, as well as other programs in which professional development is an allowable activity (e.g., Title I, Vocational Education, Bilingual Education, and Technology Literacy Challenge Grants). Coordinate with the National Science Foundation to implement strategies to improve the skills of teachers through the professional development programs of both agencies.
- **Licensing standards.** Through the Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching, support states' efforts to align licensing and certification requirements with challenging content standards and performance-based assessments.
- **Teacher recognition and accountability.** Support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and programs that reward good teachers and address the problems of incompetent ones.
- **Workplace knowledge.** Promote public-private sector partnerships, such as industry-based internships, that increase teachers' knowledge and skills of the changing workplace.
- **Research, development, evaluation, and dissemination.**
  - The National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development Program will evaluate the program's alignment with high state standards and principles of duration and intensity.
  - Provide educators and policymakers with valid, research-based strategies for improving quality.
  - Increase support for quality teaching and professional development among government, business, community leaders, and the general public through outreach and dissemination of information.
  - Establish the Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching to work with stakeholders and carry out applied research.
  - Establish a Teacher Policy Center to conduct research on policies related to teaching.
- **Monitoring trends.** Issue a biennial national report card on teacher quality starting in 1998.

Objective 1.5: Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts.

Performance Indicators

30. *The percentage of students who come to school prepared for learning and having completed their homework, as rated by their teachers, will increase substantially over the next five years, especially among children from low-income families.*
31. *The percentage of young children who read regularly at home with their parents and on their own (at least 15 minutes a day, five days a week) will increase to 90% by 2002.*
32. *The percentage of parents who meet with teachers about their children's learning will show continuous improvement, reaching 90% by 2002.*
33. *The percentage of parents who say that the school actively encourages and facilitates family involvement will show continuous improvement.*
34. *By 2002 the number of children participating in after-school programs will double, from 1.7 million to 3.4 million children. (Legislation needed)*

Over 30 years of research clearly shows that all families—whether they are rich or poor, whether the parents finished high school or not, or whether kids are in preschool or high school—can help their children learn. Greater family involvement in children's learning is a critical link to achieving a high-quality education and a safe, disciplined learning environment for every student.

Core Strategies

- **Public understanding and outreach**. Promote family and community involvement in the learning of children in school and after school through public awareness campaigns in major newspapers and educational organization publications; outreach efforts to provide information on programs, research, and best practices; and by making materials in Spanish available to families.
- **Partnership for Family Involvement in Education.**
  - Sign on 1,000 new members annually by outreach efforts of current partners and membership drives at public forums.
  - Develop opportunities and capacity for schools, families, communities, and employers to work together through continuing nationwide activities of the Partnership (Read*Write*Now; America Goes Back to School, and a new initiative focused on middle schools).
- **Program assistance and support for family involvement**. Provide support for parental involvement by expanding Goals 2000 parent assistance centers to every state, providing technical assistance to support Title I compacts, continuing parental outreach and information in School-to-Work, supporting parents of children with disabilities through the IDEA Parent Training and Information Centers, and implementing the 21st Century Learning Centers.
- **Family involvement in civil rights to education.** Create partnerships among parents, community groups, and a broad range of stakeholders to engage in collaborative efforts to ensure equal educational opportunity for all students. Provide civil rights information, technical expertise, and other assistance in building these linkages.
- **Research, development, and evaluation**.
  - Launch a systematic analytic agenda to identify and highlight programs and practices that successfully engage families, schools, and communities in school improvement efforts.
  - Disseminate the latest research findings that help prepare teachers to support family involvement activities to institutions and organizations that provide pre-service and in-service programs.
  - Evaluate the activities of the Partnership and its members.
- **New after-school programs**. To support students and families after school and to extend learning time and promote safety, help create new after-school programs by expanding the role of the Community Partners and by providing federal program assistance (Title I, 21st Century Learning Centers, and dissemination of materials). *Legislation needed.*

Objective 1.6: Greater public school choice will be available to students and families.

Performance Indicators

35. *By 2002, 25% of all public school students in grades 3-12 will attend a school that they or their parents have chosen.*
36. *By 2001 a minimum of 40 states will have charter school legislation.*
37. *By 2002 there will be 3,000 charter schools in operation around the nation.*
38. *School districts will increasingly make choice available to their students through magnet schools, charter schools, and open enrollment policies.*

Research on public schools that provide choice suggests that the sense of ownership by school staff, students, and parents helps to galvanize effort towards common goals. Information on the educational effects of choice programs is limited; most charter schools are just getting started. Further work needs to be done on documenting the implementation and quality of public schools of choice and sharing the most promising strategies with the field.

The Department of Education is encouraging expansion of choice within the public school system with alternatives such as charter schools, magnet schools, and systemwide strategies that make every public school a school of choice, thereby enabling all students and their parents to choose their school.

- Charter schools are intended to give teachers, parents, and other members of local communities the flexibility to experiment with innovative methods of achieving educational excellence. At the same time, they should help all students have access to quality schooling. Because they are new schools, charters require start-up funds and support that the Department helps to provide through its Charter School program.

- For several decades, magnet schools have provided the most widespread opportunity for families to exercise choice. The Department's Magnet School program provides support for magnet schools that are intended to achieve desegregation goals, particularly in our largest cities.

Core Strategies

- **Engage the public**. Expand support by the public and policymakers for the development of high-quality charter and magnet schools.
- **Financial support and technical assistance**.
  - Through the Charter Schools Grants program, help states and schools effectively plan and implement charter schools that have flexibility from state and district rules, are open to all students, and are held accountable for improving student achievement.
  - Continue to support implementation of magnet schools through grants to school districts under the Magnet Schools program, providing opportunities and choice for students and promoting desegregation within high-quality education settings.
- **Research and development**. Support research on public school choice, including evaluations of the effectiveness of charter schools and magnet schools, and promote the development of models and materials to help parents, teachers, and communities to design effective school choice programs.
- **Outreach**.
  - Disseminate information on strategies for expanding high-quality school choice programs that improve student achievement and share lessons learned from research about school choice.
  - Increase awareness and support for effective public school choice programs among government, business leaders, and community leaders, and the general public through outreach and dissemination of information.

Objective 1.7: Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.

Performance Indicators

39. *Students who have access to high-quality educational technology will show improved achievement in core academic subjects and improved technological literacy.*
40. *The ratio of students per modern multimedia computer will improve to 5:1 by 2001.*
41. *The percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Information Superhighway will increase from 14% in 1996 to 25% in 1998, and higher percentages thereafter.*
42. *At least 50% of teachers will integrate high-quality educational technology, high-quality software, and the Information Superhighway into their school curricula, by 2001.*
43. *Students in high poverty schools and students with disabilities will have access to advanced technology (including assistive technology for students with disabilities) that is comparable to that in other schools by 2001.*
44. *At least 60% of teachers, school administrators, and school librarians will have been trained on use of computers and the Internet to help students learn, by 2001.*

Hundreds of studies have found that, when properly used, technology improves many aspects of education, including student learning, teacher professional development, classroom management, and school administration. As an instructional tool, technology helps students master basic skills, solve complex real-life problems that require advanced skills, and prepare for the world of work.

Few schools have adequate numbers of modern computers or access to the Internet, and relatively few teachers are prepared to use technology effectively. Further, access to computers and other technologies is not enough; integration of technology into the curriculum is also needed. We must create an infrastructure that will enable all students to leave school with the technology skills needed for work and further education. Finally, we must encourage development of software and universal design interfaces that make advanced technology fully accessible to students with disabilities.

Core Strategies

- **Technology connections, especially for high-poverty schools**.
  - Use the Federal Communications Commission's Universal Service Fund discounts and "NetDays" to wire schools for using educational technology and to connect them to the Internet.
  - Encourage use of technology connections, such as voice mail, faxes, and e-mail, to stimulate communication between families, communities, teachers, and schools.
- **Access to modern computers and other technology**.
  - Encourage local, state, federal and private sector partnerships to provide access to modern computers for all teachers and students, including those in high-poverty schools.
  - Provide financial support through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and other programs to states and districts to plan, purchase, and use modern computers and other educational technology.
  - Support development, dissemination, and use of assistive technology that enables students with disabilities to participate fully in education programs. Key programs include research by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research and support from the Assistive Technology program and IDEA.
- **Effective software**. Using state and local standards as guides and building on research and development of effective practices, including those developed with support of the Technology Literacy Challenge Grants, work with the private sector to develop effective and engaging software and on-line learning resources as an integral part of school curriculum.
- **Program coordination**. Through our technology initiative, coordinate Department technology programs (Technology Challenge programs, regional consortia, Star Schools, IDEA technology and media services, assistive technology, Ready-to-Learn Television, and telecommunications math

programs); other programs that can support technology, such as Title I and IDEA; and programs and services in other federal agencies such as the National Science Foundation.

- **Professional development**. Building on new teaching standards, support teacher training through federal programs such as Eisenhower Professional Development, Technological Literacy Challenge Fund, Star Schools, Bilingual Education, Vocational Education, and Title I programs, and by working with the National Science Foundation. In partnership with states, local districts, and the private sector, create new incentives and approaches and provide technical assistance that will help teachers use technology more effectively.

Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.

To foster the achievement of world-class student performance discussed in Goal 1, reform efforts need to focus on three main areas.

1. Promoting family and community efforts to support children's early development and education, to ensure that all children have an appropriate preparation for school.

2. Identifying what students will need to know and be able to do in core subject areas and what strategies are effective in improving instruction. Federal programs and efforts across the nation must focus on enabling all students to master fundamental and advanced reading and math skills. Children need to be able to read independently and effectively by the end of third grade, to be able to apply reading to learning other subjects.

   Similarly, acquiring mathematics skills and knowledge that prepare students for algebra, geometry, and more advanced work is critical to student success in high school and beyond. In mathematics, the latest results from the Third International Mathematics and Science Study affirm that poor U.S. performance in the eighth grade is linked to mediocre content, lack of instructional rigor, and inadequate training and support for quality teaching.

3. Meeting the diverse needs of the student population, so that all students—including limited-English proficient students, students with disabilities, migrant students, students in high-poverty schools, and any students at risk of not achieving the knowledge and skills required to achieve high state standards—receive the support and encouragement they need to succeed.

To address these three areas, the Department:

- Provides financial support to states and local school districts to help underwrite improvement.
- Will be offering voluntary, national tests in reading and math so that parents and communities will know how well their children and schools are performing in these two critical areas compared with those in other communities.
- Is implementing priority initiatives in reading and math to bring together resources throughout the Department as well as involve key partners in education and the business community in support.
- Promotes educational practices conducive to learning for all students.
- Eliminates discriminatory practices within schools that contribute to deficiencies in achievement.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 2

Goal 2 relies on having timely and accurate information with which to track the preparation of young children for school and the progress of all students in reaching challenging standards. Sources for this information include special analyses of the National Assessment of Educational Progress for high-poverty and Title I schools, and state and local assessments. The proposed national tests in reading and math will become a highly valuable source of information once they are implemented in states and communities.

- Cross-cutting evaluations of Goals 2000 and the reauthorized elementary and secondary programs are documenting how states and communities are implementing reforms to enable all students to achieve to challenging standards. Services provided to students who are the target populations for federal programs are a special focus. Studies have examined the supports that federal programs are providing to improve curriculum, technology, professional development, and parental engagement.

- In the early implementation of the Even Start program, evaluation documented how more intensive programs—especially the parenting education component—were associated with strong program results for children. This and other findings helped to shape Even Start's reauthorization. Evaluations will continue to document how services affect children's school readiness and help parents support learning at home.

Objective 2.1: All children enter school ready to learn.

Performance Indicators

1. *Kindergarten and first grade teachers will increasingly report that their students enter school ready to learn reading and math.*
2. *The disparity in preschool participation rates between children from high-income families and children from low-income families will decline year by year.*
3. *The percentage of children from birth to five years old whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly will continually increase.*

Recent research has highlighted the importance of the earliest years of life for children's later success. Children's early learning experiences, or lack of them, have consequences that extend into the long-term. Research on early brain development reveals that if some learning experiences are not introduced to children at an early age, the children will find learning more difficult later. Furthermore, children who enter school ready to learn are more likely to achieve to high standards than children who are inadequately prepared. High-quality preschool and child care are integral in preparing children adequately for school.

Core Strategies

- **Interagency coordination, including services integration**. Support children at risk of early school failure by coordinating with the Department of Health and Human Service's (HHS) Head Start program, HHS' and Department of Agriculture's nutrition support programs, and other federal programs and services for young children to ensure that their needs are met and to reduce the burden on families and schools of working with multiple providers.
- **Financial support for children who are educationally disadvantaged or have disabilities.** Provide resources to states and local school districts under Title I for preschool programs and Even Start, and to states and local providers under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) for programs aimed at infants and toddlers and preschool children with disabilities or at risk of developing disabling conditions.
- **Research, development, and technical assistance**.
  - Identify, evaluate, and encourage the use of programs for young children that make use of the latest research on early brain development, early intervention, and high-quality nurturing.
  - Develop, field test, and evaluate models of effective practice through such programs as Even Start that can be shared with local Head Start, Title I preschool, and IDEA preschool projects and with states, local districts, and community-based organizations.
  - Work with experts to develop an agreed-upon definition of school readiness and to establish a core set of standards that Even Start, Title I preschool, and IDEA programs will use with preschoolers.
- **Development and dissemination of easy-to-use kits for learning at home**. Support family practices that encourage early learning by developing and disseminating educational materials for parents and their young children, such as the Ready*Set*Read Early Childhood Kit.
- **Development of readiness indicators**. Develop indicators of young children's knowledge and school readiness by working with HHS and other organizations, incorporating measures from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study and other studies of children's school readiness.

Objective 2.2: Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.

Performance Indicators

4. *Increasing percentages of fourth-graders will meet basic, proficient, and advanced levels in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).*
5. *At least 25% of students will participate in the national reading test by spring 1999; increasing percentages thereafter will participate.*
6. *By 2001 the America Reads Challenge corps will prepare tutors for 3 million children, including at least 100,000 college work-study tutors annually. (Legislation needed.)*
7. *Increasing percentages of teachers of kindergarten through third grade will complete intensive professional development to enable them to skillfully teach reading.*

In 1994, 40% of fourth-graders failed to attain the basic level of reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress and 70% did not attain the proficient level. Although reading problems are particularly severe for disadvantaged students, students with reading difficulties represent a cross-section of American children. As more and more jobs require better reading skills, many students will have to improve their reading skills.

The Department's existing programs make a vital contribution to the reading success of young children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides reading services to millions of children each year. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and bilingual education funds under Title VII also support reading services for children. Although teachers and schools have the critical responsibility for literacy, studies find that sustained, individual attention and tutoring after school and over the summer can raise reading levels when combined with parental involvement and quality school instruction.

Core Strategies

- **Legislation.** Work with Congress to pass the America Reads Challenge legislation.
- **Financial support for children with special needs**. Provide in-class reading instruction with upgraded standards and curriculum—especially for children in kindergarten through third grade. Key programs that support reading instruction include Title I Grants for Disadvantaged Children, Bilingual Education, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and Even Start.
- **Voluntary national test**.
  - Support the development and effective use of a national, voluntary test in reading so that parents, teachers, and communities have a benchmark for children's progress.
  - Provide accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency in taking the national test, including providing reports for parents in English and several other languages.
- **Public information**. Provide information via the world wide web and other means to bring about an understanding of what it means to read independently and share strategies that teachers, parents, and others can use to help students achieve this goal.
- **Community partnerships**. Encourage community partnerships that sponsor reading tutors (the America Reads Challenge, Read*Write*Now, Parents as First Teachers, and college work-study).
- **Research and development**.
  - Support state-of-the-art research—including a reading center—to test, validate, disseminate, and encourage the use of effective approaches to reading instruction and tutoring, especially for students experiencing difficulty with reading.
  - Coordinate with reading research conducted for children with learning disabilities by the National Institute for Child Health and Development (NICHD).
- **Evaluation and performance measurement.** Through evaluation studies and support to improve state and local performance data systems, provide useful information on how states and communities are doing in improving children's reading.

Objective 2.3: Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.

Performance Indicators

8. *More eighth-graders reach the basic level or higher levels of proficiency in math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress; on international assessments, at least 60% will score at the international median by 2002, and at least 15% will be in the top 10% by 2002.*
9. *At least 25% of students will participate in the national math test by spring 1999; increasing percentages thereafter will participate.*
10. *Each year, more new teachers will enter the workforce with adequate preparation to teach challenging mathematics to students in kindergarten through eighth grade.*
11. *Each year, more teachers in grades 5-8 will complete intensive professional development to enable them to teach challenging mathematics.*
12. *Each year, increasing numbers of schools will have access to and use information on best practices for math instruction.*

Mathematics is a basic skill—the gateway to learning many more advanced skills, the language of technology and science, a tool for analysis and problem solving, and a prerequisite for success in a wide variety of careers. Leading employers emphasize the need for U.S. students to excel in quantitative and problem-solving skills in order to succeed in the workplace. Math, like reading, has a key academic turning point; for math this occurs around eighth grade. Eighth-graders are often put on different tracks that they follow through high school and even beyond; math often determines what that track will be.

Notwithstanding math's importance, U.S. students fail to achieve to the high standards needed for math success. The recent Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) showed that although U.S. fourth-graders perform above the international average in math, our eighth-graders scored below the international average. The study also showed that we do not expect eighth-graders to master material as challenging as the material that students in high-performing nations master by that grade.

Core Strategies

- **Voluntary national test**.
  - Support the development of a national, voluntary test in math so that parents and communities have a benchmark for their children's progress.
  - Use the test as a means of encouraging schools, districts, states, business, and communities to improve math curricula, instruction, teacher training, and professional development.
  - Provide accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency in taking the test, including providing reports for parents in English and several other languages.
- **Professional development programs**. Strengthen the Department's existing programs that support teacher preparation and upgrading teacher skills for math instruction—especially for teachers of fourth through eighth grades—such as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Eisenhower Professional Development program, and the Individuals with Disabilities Act Professional Development.
- **Challenging standards**. Promote upgraded standards and curriculum for math instruction through Goals 2000, the Eisenhower Professional Development program, and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and by working with the National Science Foundation.
- **Public information.** Increase public understanding and support for mastering challenging mathematics by the end of eighth grade through partnerships with key education, mathematics, and professional organizations; further collaborative activity with the National Science Foundation; and providing concrete information about what students should be able to do in mathematics.
- **Research, development, and dissemination**. Based on state-of-the-art research, develop high quality materials on effective practices and tools for improving math curriculum, professional development, software, instruction, and family and community support; widely disseminate these materials; and promote the use of these materials by states, schools, teachers, and families.

Objective 2.4: Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.

Outcome indicators for children and youth in special populations are included throughout Goals 1 and 2 and especially in the key outcome indicators for elementary and secondary education on page 15.

Performance Indicators

13. *States will implement appropriate procedures for assessing and reporting progress towards achieving to high standards by students who have disabilities, are limited English proficient, or are children of migrant workers, by 2001.*
14. *The number of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum, instruction, and support services for at-risk students will increase annually.*
15. *Increasing percentages of administrators and educators working with at-risk children will have access to and use high-quality information and technical assistance on effective practices provided by Department-sponsored technical assistance and research centers as well as through professional associations and publications.*
16. *Increasing percentages of teachers will be equipped with strategies to enable students with limited English proficiency or disabilities to meet challenging standards.*
17. *Federal technical assistance and other support to states will result in annual increases in the number of states and local school districts with the capacity to disaggregate and report out assessment data aligned with standards for at-risk students.*

At-risk children need the same high quality schooling that is our goal for all students plus extra supports to help them succeed. These children may include students with limited-English proficiency or disabilities, migrant students, students in high-poverty schools, and others who are the focus of federal programs. Federal support is critical to ensuring that these students are not left behind in the drive for higher standards. Working to enable at-risk children to reach the high standards expected of all students must figure prominently in reform efforts. Whole-school approaches or targeted interventions must be based on the best research and promising practices from the field. Assessment of our nation's progress must be measured in terms of not only how well states, districts, and schools perform overall, but also in terms of how at-risk students fare.

Core Strategies

- **Challenging standards in federal programs**. Work with states and districts to ensure that the standards set for students served by federal programs are the same challenging standards set for all children through providing technical assistance, guidance, and models of effective implementation of challenging standards.
- **Assessment with accommodations**. Promote the development of assessments aligned with high standards that make appropriate accommodations for children with disabilities and limited English proficiency.
- **Financial support**. Provide significant resources to states, local school districts, and other education providers to improve achievement for children with special needs and assist states in providing education that meets civil rights requirements for free and appropriate education. The Department funds major programs aimed at disadvantaged children or children with disabilities, including:
  - Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (education for disadvantaged children)
  - Migrant education programs
  - Title I program for neglected and delinquent children
  - Programs for homeless children and youth
  - Indian education
  - Bilingual education
  - Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) program
- **Research, development, dissemination and technical assistance on promising practices**. Support and share research on the most promising practices through the research institutes and R&D centers of

the Department's Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA), and the Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) to focus on strategies for teaching and assessing children with special needs. In particular, provide technical assistance and disseminate information on including children with disabilities in the general curriculum in the least restrictive environment.

- **Professional development**. Support professional development that equips teachers with strategies to enable students with limited English proficiency or disabilities to meet challenging standards. Key programs include professional development programs sponsored under the Individual with Disabilities Act and Bilingual Education Act, as well as that provided under Title I.
- **Evaluation and continuous improvement**.
  - Conduct evaluations of federally supported programs to determine the extent to which new program provisions support standards-based reforms and continuous improvement to help students meet challenging academic standards.
  - Use evaluations to inform continuous improvement of programs.

New Help for Families to Pay for College

The balanced budget signed into law in August 1997 provides the largest investment in higher education since the G.I. Bill in 1945. The tax cuts and education spending provisions contained in this bill will help make the first two years of college universally available and they will give many more working Americans the financial means to go back to school if they want to choose a new career or upgrade their skills. When fully phased in, 12.9 million students are expected to benefit from these tax cuts—5.8 million under the HOPE Scholarship tax credit, and 7.1 million claiming the Lifetime Learning tax credit.

- **Up to a $1,500 tax credit for students starting college**: The HOPE Scholarship tax credit helps make the first two years of college universally available. Students (or the parents of dependent students) will receive a tax credit of 100% on the first $1,000 of tuition and required fees (less grants, scholarships, and other tax-free educational assistance) and 50% on the second $1,000. The HOPE Scholarship credit can be claimed in two taxable years for students who are in their first two years of postsecondary education and who are enrolled on at least a half-time basis for any portion of the year. This credit will be available for payments after December 31, 1997, for college enrollment after that date. The credit is phased out for joint filers with adjusted gross income (AGI) of between $80,000 and $100,000 and single filers with AGI of between $40,000 and $50,000.

- **The Lifetime Learning tax credit**: This tax credit is designed to assist a broad cross section of Americans—adults who want to go back to school to upgrade their skills; juniors, seniors, and graduate and professional students; people requiring new educational training to change careers; and people who want to take a course or two to improve themselves. A family will receive a 20% tax credit for the first $5,000 of tuition and required fees (less grants, scholarships, and other tax-free educational assistance) paid each year through 2002, and for the first $10,000 thereafter. The Lifetime Learning tax credit is available on a per-taxpayer (family) basis and is phased out at the same income levels as the HOPE scholarship. Families will be able to claim a Lifetime Learning tax credit for some members of their family and the HOPE Scholarship credit for others who qualify.

- **Expanded Savings Opportunities**: Several provisions of the balanced budget make it easier for families to save for their children's college expenses:
  - Beginning January 1, 1998, taxpayers may withdraw funds from an IRA, without penalty, for the postsecondary education expenses of the taxpayer, a spouse, a child, or even a grandchild.
  - For each child under 18, families may deposit $500 per year into an Educational IRA in the child's name. Earnings will accumulate tax free and no taxes will be due upon withdrawal if used to pay expenses at a postsecondary institution before the child turns 30.
  - Qualified state-sponsored tuition plans may now include savings for certain room and board expenses for students who attend at least half-time. Withdrawals are eligible for the HOPE Scholarship and Lifetime Learning tax credits.

- **Easier Student Loan Repayment**: Students or their families can, beginning in 1998, take a tax deduction for interest paid in the first 60 months of repayment on their student loans. In addition, student loan amounts forgiven by non-profit, tax-exempt, charitable or educational institutions for borrowers who take community-service jobs that address unmet needs will be excluded from income.

- **Expanded Pell Grants for Needy and Deserving Students**: The balanced budget agreement also provides for a substantial $300 increase in the Pell Grant maximum award, to $3,000. This builds upon last year's increase of $230 in the maximum award to begin to restore the lost buying power of Pell Grants for students at the lowest income level.

Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.

Postsecondary Education

Postsecondary education has been America's traditional gateway to the professions, more challenging jobs, and higher wages. American postsecondary education has become world-class, and foreign nations have sent thousands of their future leaders here for training. Business, government, and the field of education itself have eagerly sought postsecondary graduates, including graduates from two-year technical programs. Given current trends, at least two years of postsecondary education will be increasingly necessary in the next century to gain higher earnings and improved job opportunities.

Although American higher education is the envy of the world, almost 40% of our own high school graduates do not immediately attend postsecondary education. Moreover, postsecondary enrollment and completion rates are significantly lower for blacks and Hispanics and for students from lower- and middle-income families than for whites and those from higher-income families. Although enrollment rates have been rising in recent years, postsecondary education remains an elusive option for too many American high school graduates.

To help ensure access to postsecondary education, we need to continue to make progress in three key areas, ensuring that:

1. All students leave high school with the academic background and preparation to pursue postsecondary education. Movement toward achievement of Goals 1 and 2 will go a long way toward making this a reality. We also need to help motivate students to continue their education beyond high school by providing them with earlier and better information about what the benefits of postsecondary education are, what admission requirements are, how much college costs, and how they can get financial aid to help pay postsecondary costs.

2. All students motivated and academically ready to attend postsecondary education have the financial resources and support services needed to do so.

3. The student aid delivery system is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.

Lifelong Learning

While overcoming barriers to postsecondary enrollment and completion for young people is critical to our nation, it is equally essential to encourage lifelong learning, whether it be graduate school or adult basic education, advanced technical training or training in job entry skills. This includes many for whom lifelong learning opportunities are of special importance, such as persons with disabilities, adults lacking basic skills, and those whose job skills need upgrading or who require retraining because of labor market changes.

Persons with disabilities are at least twice as likely as people without disabilities to be unemployed. Their low employment rate is estimated to cost society in excess of $2 billion annually. At the end of 1994, 19.5% of the working-age population—30.7 million people—had a disability, and 14.5 million of these were considered to have a severe limitation.

Adults who haven't graduated from high school or postsecondary programs are also at a serious disadvantage when competing for jobs and maintaining their independence from government support.

The National Adult Literacy Survey of 1992 showed that at least 21% of adults age 16 and older lacked basic reading and math skills needed for well-paying jobs or entry into higher education.

To address these problems, the Department is giving priority to improving the quality of its rehabilitation and adult education programs, including identifying best practices and updating performance data systems to provide feedback for program improvement. It also is supporting work with other federal agencies to coordinate programs and improve employment outcomes for adults with disabilities and adults who need basic skills education, especially those on welfare.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 3

In developing our goals, objectives, and strategies in Goal 3, the Department relied on a number of evaluations, research studies, and management analyses. Specifically,

- A number of research studies have been and are being conducted using data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics and the Census Department and targeted studies of specific populations affected by changes in legislation or policy. These studies are being used to assess the educational effects of the student aid programs and to help pinpoint where barriers to postsecondary education and lifelong learning remain for certain groups within the population. Strategies are then developed to help overcome these barriers.

- A series of management analyses—including the Direct Loan evaluation, customer satisfaction surveys, and studies of the "gatekeeping" process that determines which postsecondary institutions are eligible to participate in the student aid programs—aided in the identification of successes and problems in the management of the student aid programs. Another major source of evaluation information has been the General Accounting Office (GAO) reports on student financial aid management.

- Evaluations of the TRIO, adult education, and vocational rehabilitation programs were used to identify critical strategies for program improvement. For example, prior studies on adult education made it clear that the field urgently needs information on effective practices and improved state and local performance data, both of which are plan strategies as well as current evaluation priorities.

Objective 3.1: Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.

Performance Indicators

1. *Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students while the enrollment gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.*
2. *Increasing percentages of students from age 12 through high school and their parents will have an accurate assessment of the cost of attending college and the aid available for college by 2002.*
3. *The percentage of students from age 12 through high school who are aware of the academic requirements for college or postsecondary vocational enrollment will increase annually.*
4. *By October 2001 there will be a single point of contact that allows students to get information on federal student aid, apply for aid, and have their eligibility for aid determined within four days of electronic application, cutting in half the current processing time. (Requires approval of electronic signature.)*

Research has shown that to help students attend and complete college, motivating them and their families to anticipate and plan for college early and providing students with needed non-financial support are at least as important as ensuring financial assistance. This is particularly true for low-income students. A recent study showed that, overall, less than half of eighth-graders from families in the bottom third of the income distribution are attending a postsecondary institution within two years of graduating from high school (44%). However, 88% of low-income students who take a rigorous high school program go on to college.

Core Strategies

- **National campaign for middle-school students.** Launch a national campaign to motivate middle-school students and their parents to prepare for higher education by providing information on (1) the benefits of education beyond high school, academic requirements for college admission, and financial costs of attending postsecondary institutions; (2) availability and value of financial aid; and (3) the support services and programs available in their state and local areas. Special emphasis will be placed on developing strategies to reach low-income and first-generation college families.
- **Sector coordination.** Provide incentives and guidance for increased coordination between K–12 schools and postsecondary institutions to ensure that students are ready for college.
- **Outreach and dissemination initiatives.** Enhance the effectiveness of the TRIO Upward Bound and Talent Search programs by improving outreach and dissemination efforts and by applying the latest research on effective strategies to assist disadvantaged students.
- **Develop a student- and family-focused "system" to support postsecondary education using computer and information technologies.**
  - Develop procedures to give students and families a simple mechanism for electronically applying for student financial aid through the world wide web (*legislative authority may be needed for full implementation*). This system will give prospective students a single point of contact for all federal student aid programs, and, eventually, with the cooperation of the postsecondary education community, will respond to all their financial aid questions, including estimates of likely federal aid amounts and costs associated with attending specific schools.
  - Work with the financial aid community and Congress to implement the use of a multi-year promissory note for student loans that will streamline application procedures, minimize delays in receiving funds, and provide better consumer information for borrowers. (*Requires legislative action.*)

Objective 3.2: Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.

Performance Indicators

5. *Unmet need (the percentage of a student's total cost of education that is not met by student and family contribution and all sources of financial aid)—a measure of opportunity or access to postsecondary education—will show decreases over time, especially for low-income students.*
6. *The percentage of borrowers with student loan debt repayments exceeding 10% of their income will remain stable or decline over time.*
7. *Graduation rates for all students in four-year and two-year colleges will improve, while the gap in completion rates between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority students will decrease.*
8. *Participants receiving support services through the TRIO programs will enroll in and complete postsecondary programs at rates higher than comparable non-participants.*

Education increasingly determines who will prosper in our economy and who will not. Most of today's good jobs require more skills and training than a high school diploma can provide. Proof of the critical importance of postsecondary education is the large and growing economic return to education. Fifteen years ago a worker with a college degree made 38% more, on average, than a worker with a high school diploma. Today, that difference is 73%.

Economic efficiency and fairness require that we make at least two years of postsecondary education as universally available as a high school diploma is now. Unfortunately, the cost of college limits access for many low- and middle-income families. The average cost of attending a public college increased from 9% of the typical family's income in 1979 to 14% in 1994. The Administration has worked with Congress to enact tax relief and has succeeded in passing a comprehensive package of proposals—additional tax relief, increased grant aid and work-study assistance, and reduced borrowing costs—to help ensure that postsecondary education is affordable for all Americans.

Core Strategies

- **Financial aid programs.**
  - Provide aid to postsecondary education students through the Pell Grant program, Campus-based programs (Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants, Work-Study, and Perkins Loans), Federal Family Education Loan program, and Direct Student Loan program. Carry out activities to strengthen and improve the capacity of the schools to administer aid programs.
  - Help student loan borrowers manage their debt by informing students of the availability of flexible repayment options in the Direct Loan program, encouraging lenders in the FFEL program to also offer flexible repayment options, and working with postsecondary institutions to provide good debt management counseling before a student borrows, before leaving school, and while the student is in repayment.
- **New financial aid initiatives**. Provide financial support for postsecondary education to students and parents through the tax system by working with the Treasury Department to implement the two tax credits for postsecondary education. In particular, ED will work to ensure that all Americans who might benefit are informed about the new tax credits and know how to use them.
- **Support services.** Provide federal support and technical assistance for the higher education programs, in particular the TRIO and Aid for Institutional Development programs, that are key in providing the services needed to help disadvantaged students enter and complete postsecondary education.
- **Streamlined processes for aid delivery.** Initiate a pilot project with postsecondary schools to have their students receive federal aid disbursements through streamlined processes similar to those used for electronic benefits transfers.

Objective 3.3: Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.

Performance Indicators

9. *Customer satisfaction ratings among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs will increase to 90% by 2001.*
10. *The annual number of students and families submitting or renewing their federal student aid applications electronically will continue to increase each year, almost doubling to 3 million by October 2001.*
11. *The accuracy and integrity of data supplied by applicants, institutions, lenders, and guaranty agencies will show continuous yearly improvements.*
12. *Evaluation of contracts for major OPE financial aid systems will indicate that the government and the taxpayer are receiving "better than fully successful" performance (including quality, cost control, and timeliness).*
13. *There will be no material internal weaknesses identified in the student aid programs' portions of the Department-wide financial statement audit; and there will be no student aid program issues that prevent the Department from receiving an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.*
14. *The percentage of postsecondary institutions found to be in substantial compliance with federal requirements will increase each year.*
15. *The annual recovery rate on defaulted student loans will show continuous improvement.*
16. *The cohort default rates—the percentage of borrowers leaving school who default within two years—for the Federal Family Education Loan and the Direct Loan Program will decline to a level of 10% or less by 2002.*
17. *During 1998, the length of time to fully complete a loan consolidation application will average no more than 60-90 days; future surveys of borrowers will show that an increasing percentage of applicants for loan consolidation are highly satisfied with the timeliness and accuracy of the loan consolidation process.*
18. *By September 1998, ED will have a complete system architecture developed for the delivery of federal student financial aid; implementing this design will improve customer service and increase control over federal costs.*

In 1997-98, ED will provide almost $43 billion through its student financial assistance programs (including grants, loans, and work-study) to help students attend postsecondary institutions. Ensuring the effective and efficient delivery of these funds is one of the Department's highest priorities. In recent years, great strides have been made in improving the management of the student aid programs.

- Over a four-year period, default rates dropped by over 50%, from 22.4% of loans entering repayment in FY 1990 to 10.7% of loans entering repayment in FY 1994.
- Improved institutional oversight by the Department has led to the removal of 875 schools, including 672 schools from all student aid programs and an additional 203 from federal loan programs.
- The Department has implemented rigorous certification standards for institutions to participate in the student aid programs; as a result, about 33% of initial applications to participate in the student aid programs have been rejected in the last three years—double the percentage in 1990.
- More than 1,000 schools of questionable capacity have been placed on provisional certification during the past four years so that the Department can move quickly to remove them from participating in the student aid program should problems arise.

Although significant improvements have been made, a great deal still needs to be done before the management of the student aid programs is all that it should be. As noted in a number of reports by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General, many management and operations problems still remain. Perhaps the most important of these are: (1) the various student aid systems are incompletely integrated, (2) financial data from aid programs are only partially consolidated at the student level, and (3) too many contractors use different operating systems. Correcting this situation will require the redesign and modernization of the federal financial aid system using the latest information engineering

and computer system technology. In addition, The Department is also committed to strengthening our oversight of the student aid programs while reducing burden for high-performing institutions.

Core Strategies

- **Customer satisfaction.**
  - Emphasize customer service in all facets of operation and continue to monitor satisfaction levels among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs.
  - Use the best of computer and information technologies to help students and their parents learn about and apply for student financial aid. This will include:
    - a simple and secure mechanism for electronically completing, through the world wide web, the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) used to apply for student financial aid.
    - a single point of contact for all federal student aid programs to address all financial aid questions, including estimates of likely federal aid amounts and costs associated with attending specific schools.
- **An integrated, accurate, and efficient student aid delivery system.**
  - Integrate the multiple student aid databases based on student-level records.
  - Improve contract performance for major information systems by increased use of performance-based contracting and by following OMB criteria (i.e., "Raines Rules") for technology system investment proposals.
  - Use mutually-agreed-upon industry-wide standards for data exchanges to stabilize data requirements, improve data integrity, and reduce costly errors.
  - Continue or expand interagency coordination on data matches—with the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Selective Service, the U.S. Postal Service, and the Departments of Defense, Justice, and Housing and Urban Development—to help improve data accuracy and reduce burden on respondents. (*Legislative authority may be needed for full implementation.*)
  - Increase the community's use of ED's web site as a principal source of financial aid information, programmatic and technical publications, and software.
- **Effective institutional oversight.**
  - Develop and utilize a risk management system in order to target compliance and enforcement activities on poorly performing institutions while reducing burdens on high performing ones.
  - Expand use of the case management approach to maximize the effectiveness of institutional oversight. This approach encompasses review of recertification applications, compliance audits, financial statements, risk management system inputs, and program reviews.
- **Legislative support for default reduction.** Seek legislative changes that (1) increase risk sharing in the loan programs to provide more incentives for lenders and guaranty agencies to prevent defaults and (2) obtain new authorities to improve our collections from defaulted borrowers.
- **Additional interagency coordination.** Work with the Internal Revenue Service on tax refund offsets and address matches, and with the Department of Treasury on administrative offsets and student loan interest rates.
- **Support innovations in the delivery of postsecondary education.** Coordinate with states, schools, and Congress to change financial aid laws and regulations in order to support innovations in the delivery of postsecondary education, such as distance education and the creation of virtual universities, while maintaining accountability in the use of federal funds. (*Legislative action needed.*)

Objective 3.4: Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

Performance Indicators

19. *The percentage of persons who are aware of and use the Lifetime Learning tax credit will increase annually.*
20. *The percentage of persons who maintain competitive employment and earnings 24 months after completion of vocational rehabilitation will increase significantly by 2002.*
21. *In vocational rehabilitation, the percentage of all persons who obtain competitive employment after receiving vocational rehabilitation services will increase each year.*
22. *By 2002 the literacy skills of American adults will improve as shown by significantly fewer adults performing at the lowest proficiency level on national assessments.*
23. *Increasing percentages of adults enrolled in beginning adult basic education programs and English as a second language programs will achieve proficiency in basic skills as measured by standardized tests.*

The world of work continues to change rapidly. Many workers will need to upgrade their skills and some will need to be retrained for entirely new jobs. Providing educational opportunities to these adult workers will lengthen their productive years and will also benefit the economy by creating a more flexible and more highly trained workforce. The Lifetime Learning tax credit and other provisions of the balanced budget passed in August 1997 will help make lifelong learning a reality for many workers. In addition, the federal student aid programs provide a great deal of financial support for adults returning to school—in 1995-96, 18% of undergraduate recipients of Higher Education Act (Title IV) student aid were at least 30 years old.

For those adult Americans with disabilities, education must often be coupled with the provision of effective rehabilitation services if they are to succeed in competitive labor markets. The quality of rehabilitation programs is critical to ensuring that our nation's citizens with disabilities will be able to fully compete in the 21st century work world. The Department plans to increase the use of rehabilitation technology and will work to improve the efficiency of current rehabilitation programs.

National data have shown that too few adult education participants—particularly in adult basic education—stay in the program long enough to receive a substantial benefit. Moreover, the research on effective programs is very limited. The Department is sponsoring several research and evaluation projects in an effort to improve the effectiveness of adult education programs and to better integrate them with other training programs and the reformed welfare system.

Core Strategies

- **Direct financial support for lifelong learning in postsecondary education and employer-provided education.** As described in objective 3.2, the Department is committed to providing monetary support for adults wanting to return to school through the financial aid programs and the tax system. In addition, the balanced budget agreement extended Section 127 of the tax code allowing workers to exclude up to $5,250 of employer-provided education benefits from their income.
- **Financial support to states for vocational rehabilitation and adult education.** Provide grants to states to carry out adult education and rehabilitation programs (Adult Education State Grants and Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants).
- **Best practices for vocational rehabilitation.** Assist individuals with disabilities to achieve desired employment outcomes by identifying and disseminating information regarding best practices.
- **Linking vocational rehabilitation indicators with high quality performance measurement systems.** Work with states to improve the state performance measurement systems in the vocational rehabilitation program in order to ensure progress toward performance indicators and identify areas for technical assistance.

- **Rehabilitation services interagency coordination.**
  - Encourage coordination between state vocational rehabilitation agencies and state-level job training programs by awarding grants for system changes.
  - Establish a federal interagency council to promote the employment of persons with disabilities. In concert with the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Defense, Veterans Affairs, Commerce, Transportation, Justice, and the Social Security Administration, the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Board, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Small Business Administration, carry out an initiative to set in place the requisite policies and actions needed to improve employment rates and outcomes for persons with disabilities and to reduce overlap in services and programs.
- **Access to quality adult basic and secondary education.**
  - Expand the availability of high quality adult basic and secondary education to all adults lacking the necessary skills and credentials by encouraging the appropriate use of distance learning and other technologies and by coordinating with job training programs that integrate academic and workplace learning.
  - Through research by the National Center on Adult Learning and Literacy and effectiveness evaluations conducted by the Planning and Evaluation Service, identify and validate effective adult basic education and English as a second language practices and disseminate study findings in formats that are accessible to a wide audience.
- **Sound adult education state and local program management.** Establish benchmarks for adult education performance systems on the levels of expected performance from effective programs and help improve state and local performance information systems to ensure that the information needed for good program management and improvement is available.
- **Adult education an integral part of reformed welfare systems.** Strengthen the role of adult education in the new welfare-to-work systems by providing technical assistance to states and local programs on models for integrating work readiness activities into the basic skills delivery system.

U.S. Department of Education's Customer Service Standards

(Issued June 1996)

If you contact us with an inquiry about the Department of Education or ask for other information:

- We will answer your written inquiry within 15 working days.
- If you telephone us, you will speak to a knowledgeable person who will answer your question or refer it properly. You will receive no more than two referrals.
- We will answer phone calls promptly, within three rings, and return all voice-mail messages within 48 hours.
- We will respond to your e-mail messages within 48 hours.
- If you have a personal appointment with a Department employee, you will not be kept waiting.

If you request one of our publications or documents:

- Requests for single copies of publications by telephone will be sent within 48 hours.
- Request for single copies by mail and all bulk orders will be filled within 72 hours.
- Publications and documents will be made available in alternative formats on request.
- We will give you the option to receive information in electronic form where possible.

If you contact us about a complaint:

- We will respond to written complaints within 15 working days.
- If you telephone us with a complaint, we will advise you on the telephone or refer your complaint to the proper source.

If you are a prospective grant applicant or existing grantee, or if you are a prospective or current recipient of student financial assistance:

- We will disseminate timely and accurate information on grant opportunities and provide clear guidelines for grant proposals and criteria for selection.
- We will disseminate timely and accurate information on student financial aid application procedures and program provisions.
- We will acknowledge receipt of requests for administrative actions and other inquiries within 48 hours.
- Final response on administrative actions will be completed in 30 calendar days.
- Grant award documents will clearly identify which requests should be referred to the grant specialist or program specialist and which grantee actions do not require approval.
- We will provide timely, accurate, and dependable technical assistance.
- We will provide information that explains the final funding decision.
- We will institute sensible reporting requirements and, when conducting monitoring and site visits, perform exit interviews and make final monitoring reports available within 30 days.

Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

To help students reach challenging academic standards, to help build a solid foundation for learning for all students, and to ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning, the Department must be committed to world-class management, quality service, and customer satisfaction. To be a leader in educational reforms, the Department has to be a leader in organizational and internal performance reforms. To achieve these results requires breakthrough thinking and accomplishments—in customer service, support for our partners, educational research, technology both internal and external, workforce planning and development, financial integrity, and strategic planning and performance measurement.

To become a high-performance organization, the Department must become "results and accountability driven." This will happen when we:

- Identify our customers and meet or surpass their needs
- Set goals and establish or improve our performance measurement systems to track progress
- Determine how best to work with our partners to reach program goals
- Continually seek new ways to provide services more efficiently and with higher quality
- Identify effective practices in education through R&D and evaluation, and get the information out to our customers and partners

During the past few years, we have made much progress in transforming ED into a high performance organization. But more remains to be done. The objectives in Goal 4 and objective 3.3 in Goal 3 identify critical management processes for the Department that need ongoing attention or further development.

Use of Evaluations and Assessments in Developing Goal 4

- In its report *Department of Education: Long Standing Management Problems Hamper Reforms* (May 1993), the General Accounting Office (GAO) criticized the Department for not emphasizing good, sensible management techniques to accomplish its goals. This report further highlighted a lack of strategic planning, poor quality data, unqualified technical staff and a focus on short term fixes rather than long term solutions. This report, along with internal recognition of serious problems by new Administration officials, led to development of the Department's first strategic plan, establishment of standing committees for management reform, re-engineering of key processes including regulations and grants management, establishment of customer service standards and centralization of responses to customer inquiries, and other management reforms. Notwithstanding our having achieved significant improvements since that report, work is still needed in some of the areas it identified, including the need to improve the quality of performance data on our programs and operations.

- In 1993 and 1996, the Department surveyed all managers and staff on experiences and opinions about their work, working environment, and support. The results of the employee surveys helped to set the direction for some of the objectives in Goal 4.

- To identify ways to improve customer service, we've followed Executive Order 12862, "Setting Customer Service Standards," as well as used internal surveys of key offices and focus groups to establish strategies and measures for customer satisfaction. We tested telephone and employee responsiveness in a "mystery shopper" survey. We also reviewed several GAO reports that offered suggestions for ways to improve our service to customers.

- When our office of research and statistics (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, or OERI) was scheduled for reauthorization, the National Academy of Sciences was asked to consider how federally-supported educational research could better contribute to improving the nation's education. The Academy, through its National Research Council, convened 15 distinguished experts to conduct the study. OERI adopted many of the report's recommendations, which also influenced selection of the strategies and indicators in this plan.

- To identify priorities for research, the Department conducted over 45 discussion groups to get input on national priorities for research in education. The resulting data and recommendations appear in the report *Building Knowledge for a Nation of Learners: A Framework for Education Research, 1997.*

- To help introduce management innovations, the Department's principal office components (POCs) have joined in partnership to do management reviews and make recommendations on areas that can be improved through process improvement or organizational development activities.

- For our information technology systems, a recent independent verification and validation study by KMPG Peat Marwick on the Department's network infrastructure and operations provided important improvement recommendations. The recommendations were used in developing strategies for objective 4.4 and are being followed now as we improve our information systems.

- GAO's 1997 report on *Challenges in Promoting Access and Excellence in Education* noted the importance of having a sound integrated information technology strategy to manage a portfolio of information systems. We have included an indicator on Information Technology Investment Review Board assessments of major systems to ensure that systems are mission-driven and consistent with our information technology architecture.

Objectives, Indicators, and Strategies

Objective 4.1: Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.

Performance Indicators

1. *By 2001 at least 90% of customers, internal and external, will agree that ED products, services, and information, including those on the Department's web site, are of high quality, timely, and accessible.*
2. *Department employees and front-line service centers will meet or exceed the Department's customer service standards by 2000.*
3. *Quarterly evaluation reports for the "One-Pubs" system, based on quality assurance surveillance, will indicate that high standards of performance are achieved for dissemination of ED's information products by 2000.*

People who need answers to their queries want help, not busy signals and unreturned phone messages. Customer service isn't just a slogan, it is a necessary focus of our organization. We believe that customers should have seamless access to information and services and are striving to meet the standards we have set for customer service. (See the Department's customer service standards on page 42.) The Department has sought out feedback from customers to improve our programs and services; and this feedback has led to significant improvements in the way we do business.

Core Strategies

- **Standards.** Set, meet, and exceed the Department's customer service standards, especially on the front lines by providing employee training, regular feedback on performance, adequate resources, equipment, and incentives.
- **Customer feedback**. Develop a comprehensive, reliable system for receiving and acting on customer feedback, including customer complaints.
- **One-stop shopping for customers.** Establish a "One-Pubs" system that enables our customers to receive publications and other information products without having to track them down from several offices.
- **Public outreach.** Conduct outreach activities to increase awareness and support for the Secretary's priorities among key constituency groups and the general public, using regional meetings and events, teleconferences, newsletters, targeted mailings, national conferences, satellite town meetings, information services via the Internet, and contacts with state and local governments and other federal agencies.
- **Full access.** Ensure that customers with disabilities have access to Department services and information by expanding our TTY system capacity and establishing an alternate format center to provide both braille and audiotape.
- **Employee resources.** Provide ED employees with technology needed to respond effectively to customer requests.

Objective 4.2: Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.

Performance Indicators

4. *Surveys of states and school districts will increasingly rate the Department's technical assistance, including assistance from the integrated reviews, as very useful in improving their performance.*
5. *By 2002 the number of separate ED programs will decline significantly from the current 197 programs in FY 1997. (Requires legislative action.)*
6. *Customers will increasingly report that they have greater flexibility and better understanding of ED rules and requirements.*
7. *New discretionary grants processed using the re-engineered grant-making process will be awarded each year on a timely basis.*
8. *Reports from program monitoring teams and audit reports under the Single Audit Act will show a reduction in significant recurring findings.*
9. *The number of states participating in the Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI) will increase to meet the needs of our partners.*

Many Department programs serve similar target populations, such as educationally disadvantaged children, although each program has a different focus and purposes. To improve teaching and learning for these children, the Department needs to be organized to promote the integration of federal programs with one another as well as with state and local programs.

Two important review processes that use cross-cutting teams to provide program monitoring and technical assistance are providing states with single contacts, coordinated guidance, and a straightforward process for conflict resolution.

- The Integrated Review Team initiative (IRT) for elementary and secondary education programs promotes joint technical assistance and monitoring activities among several offices and programs that are working with the same or greatly overlapping target populations or education providers.
- The Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI) links program, auditing, and legal staffs with state program administrators to resolve financial issues.

These new processes promote cooperative, rather than adversarial, relationships between the Department and our grantees.

Further, to better support our partners and ensure that taxpayers get results for their investment, we need to continue improving our key internal processes and systems supporting federal aid to education. Some of our legislative authorities will need revision to support the Government Performance and Results Act's focus on results. To make regulations helpful to achieving program goals and accountability, they should be as flexible, performance-oriented, and unburdensome as possible. The re-engineered discretionary grants process will give the grantee community one point of contact, more time to make proposals, and more technical assistance before and after grant awards.

Core Strategies

- **Integrated program reviews.** Continue to implement protocols for conducting grant program reviews that integrate program monitoring, technical assistance, and audit resolutions through a collaborative approach among program offices and with states.
- **Technical assistance system.**
  - Create a conceptual and operational framework for delivering technical assistance through technical assistance centers, conferences, integrated reviews, ED staff, and online services.
  - Link technical assistance, monitoring and auditing activities by providing the Integrated Review Teams with results of Cooperative Audit Resolutions, and other audit findings.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the Department's technical assistance.

- **Build civil rights partnerships.** Establish constructive and collaborative relationships with state education agencies, local education agencies, parents and community groups, and other stakeholders to achieve the shared objectives of civil rights compliance and securing timely improvements for students.
- **Program streamlining and flexibility.**
  - During reauthorization, simplify legislation and design programs to be results-oriented.
  - Use the Department's waiver authorities to provide increased flexibility in exchange for increased accountability to states, school districts, and others in order to help all students achieve to challenging academic standards.
  - Support Ed-Flex partnership states as they implement their delegated waiver authority. (Ed-Flex is the Education Flexibility Demonstration Partnership Program.)
  - Encourage consolidated planning at state and local levels.
- **Regulatory/legislative reinvention.**
  - Ensure appropriate flexibility—consistent with customer recommendations, program goals, and need for accountability—in new legislation and regulations.
  - Set forth clear, straightforward expectations and options through simpler regulations and more timely, effective guidance.
  - In particular, develop postsecondary education reauthorization legislation that results in regulations and program operation guidelines that are straightforward and simplified for easier customer use.
- **Grants re-engineering.**
  - Ensure that the re-engineered decentralization of the discretionary grant-making process is operational by tracking output, closely monitoring developments to overcome roadblocks, and by providing comprehensive desk-level procedures and training for staff.
  - Ensure that formula and discretionary grants are issued to our partners in time for state and local program planning and operations, by requiring that program offices award grants by May 1 wherever beneficial to grantees.

Objective 4.3: An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.

Performance Indicators

10. Peer reviews will increasingly show that education research and statistics supported by the Department are of high quality, are focused on critical education reform issues, and contribute significantly to educational improvement.

11. Education research will increasingly meet the needs of our partners (e.g., states, schools, institutions of higher education, national associations) and our customers (teachers, parents, students, business) for reliable information on how to make schools more effective, as measured by biennial customer surveys.

12. In major and selected other programs, increasing percentages of grantees will demonstrate that their programs and services are based on sound research results.

13. Dissemination of research and assessment findings will increasingly reach key customers and result in educational improvement.

Investing in education research and evaluation contributes to our understanding of and efforts to improve education. Because of its potential to influence the well-being of the nation's youth, education research must meet the highest professional standards of scientific inquiry so that results are trustworthy. The Department, in collaboration with the National Educational Research Policy and Priority Board, is developing standards to assure that supported activities are of the highest professional excellence. To ensure its relevance and application, research must remain firmly rooted in the everyday experience of students and teachers and the reality of schools. The Department also supports a variety of national dissemination activities that make available to educators, parents, and policymakers—as well as ED program staff—the best research-based information on educational practice.

Core Strategies

- **Statistics.** Collect and effectively disseminate statistics on critical education issues used to inform the national research agenda and provide information for policy-making and program improvement.
- **National vision and priorities for research.**
  - Develop a comprehensive vision of the nation's needs for knowledge about education, and set clear priorities for education research to meet those needs.
  - Coordinate research, development, and evaluation activities across the Department and with other federal agencies, such as the National Science Foundation and HHS institutes.
- **Financial support for R&D.** Support research on education reform and improvement through such programs as the national education research institutes and centers, regional educational laboratories, National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board, National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, IDEA Research to Practice program, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and the International Education and Foreign Language Studies program.
- **Research quality.**
  - Ensure that Department-supported research and development meet the professional standards of the scientific community and are applied systematically and with rigor.
  - Develop and utilize knowledge about education systems and practices in other nations to stimulate educational improvement in the United States.
- **Research dissemination and use.**
  - Develop and implement a comprehensive dissemination system of effective practices that increases the education community's access to and use of research-based products and services.
  - Ensure that teachers, parents, and principals can obtain help in solving their school-related problems.
  - Review and give feedback on the extent to which the Department's grantees propose programs and services that are based on sound research results.
  - Ensure that research and program evaluation findings are given to program offices to improve program design and implementation.

Objective 4.4: Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.

Performance Indicators

14. *All major information systems needing repair will be converted to Year 2000 compliance on or before the end of 1998 (giving time for validation and testing during 1998 and 1999).*
15. *At least 90% of all employees will assess productivity as "significantly improved" as a result of available technology, as shown by the employee survey in 2000.*
16. *All Information Technology Investment Review Board assessments will show that major information systems are mission-driven, cost-effective, consistent with our information technology architecture, and supported by performance-based contracts.*
17. *The data-reporting burden on the public will be reduced annually.*

The Department's information systems, consisting of data, software, hardware, and telecommunications, will be integrated and promote cost effectiveness and efficiency. Employees will access the Department's reliable local and wide area network from standards-based workstations using modern, accessible, personal productivity software and hardware tools. Management of the data and systems processes will be closer to the user. Data warehousing will allow information to be shared among internal and external customers with increasing ease and with adequate security precautions to protect privacy and confidentiality.

Through the construction of an Education Enterprise Data Model, the Department will identify data requirements and use them to develop a departmental information architecture. This model and architecture will be designed so that redundancy is eliminated for new information systems, data will be captured once—where and when it is needed—and easily used by internal and external customers. Use of the Internet will enable increased public access to ED information and permit processing business transactions electronically.

Core Strategies

- **Year 2000 compliance.** Implement a major Departmental effort to become "Year 2000 data compliant" to ensure that ED's data users and customers are not affected by data corruption resulting from hardware and software that cannot correctly process date-related information. This will include early completion of revisions to major systems to permit testing and use well before 2000.
- **Network and personal computer infrastructure for the Department.** Ensure that the Department has a cost effective, efficient, accessible, and reliable network infrastructure, with modern workplace software and hardware, to promote productivity and meet business needs.
- **ED world wide web support.** Provide a robust, reliable, secure Internet service that effectively presents and distributes quality educational information and processes business transactions for our internal and external customers.
- **Cost-effective major systems that deliver for ED and its customers.** Assess current and proposed major information systems—such as student financial aid systems (as described in Goal 3), statistical systems (NCES), and financial systems (EDCAPS)—to ensure that they efficiently meet the business needs and mission of the Department. The Information Technology Investment Review Board will review new information technology investment proposals, conduct periodic reviews of on-going systems and expand the use of performance-based contracting.
- **Data warehousing.** Develop a Department-wide information collection and dissemination system using a data warehouse to provide easy access to ED data and eliminate data duplication.

Objective 4.5: The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing.

Performance Indicators

18. *By 2000, 75% of Department managers will agree that staff knowledge and skills are adequate to carry out the Department's mission.*
19. *By 2000, 75% of employees will demonstrate the basic computer competencies identified in the Department's computer competency standards.*
20. *By 2000, most employees will indicate satisfaction with their work environment (e.g., physical surroundings, noise level, air quality), security, and accessibility.*
21. *By 2000, most employees and managers will express high satisfaction with assistance on resolving employee disputes, and disputes will be closed quickly and informally whenever possible.*
22. *Expert review of the quality of Department-sponsored employee training will show that the training is among the best in the federal government and is comparable to the best in the private sector.*
23. *By 2001 at least 70% of ED employees will agree that the multi-evaluator General Performance Appraisal System (GPAS) improves individual employee performance and development and aligns employee goals with the overall mission of the Department.*

High-performing organizations are characterized by workers who understand and support the mission of the organization in which they work. Individuals are valued as contributors to the organization's mission, and the organization provides continuous learning opportunities to the extent possible. Over the next five years, the Office of Management will provide leadership in expanding the capacity of employees to perform the mission of the Department, and providing the best possible working conditions to support the Department's mission.

The results of the Department's 1996 Employee Survey highlighted the need for additional work on transforming the Department into a high-performing organization. For example, the survey found dissatisfaction with the Department's dispute resolution processes. The survey also identified a perceived inequity between services, including training and facilities, for employees in the regions versus headquarters. Low satisfaction with the physical work environment was indicated in both the 1993 and 1996 employee surveys. Strategies and performance measures have been developed to help make improvements in these areas and to assess whether recent innovations, including the multi-input performance appraisal system, have increased productivity and morale.

Core Strategies

- **High staff performance.**
  - Provide meaningful training and development opportunities to all employees (headquarters and regions) consistent with identified needs.
  - Develop specific standards of computer competency for all staff.
  - Develop and implement a comprehensive leadership development program.
  - Train employees to effectively monitor programs using the integrated review approach.
  - Assess whether the redesigned employee performance appraisal system is effective in promoting desired employee performance and employee development.
- **A fair, efficient, and responsive workplace**. Continue to re-engineer the Department's equal employment opportunity (EEO) operations and assess progress to date on the newly implemented Informal Dispute Resolution Center.
- **A healthy, safe, secure and accessible workplace for all employees**. Move headquarters employees back to renovated quarters and make improvements to other department offices or relocate staff to improved quarters.

Objective 4.6: Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.

Performance Indicators

24. *By 2000 the Education Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) will be fully implemented and providing assistant secretaries, the Chief Financial and Chief Information Officer, and program managers with consistent, timely, and reliable financial and program information, through an assessment by the Information Technology Investment Review Board.*
25. *Evaluation of contracts will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, timeliness, and other factors, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.*
26. *Auditors will issue a clean opinion on the Department-wide annual financial statements every year.*

We must ensure that taxpayer dollars are used effectively as intended by the Administration and Congress, and that fraud, waste and abuse are at a minimum. To obtain reliable results, systems must be in place to provide reliable and timely information. The Education Department's Central Automated Processing System—currently being developed—will satisfy that need.

For the past four years, the Department has received disclaimers of audit opinions because of our auditor's concerns with the integrity of the data supporting our cost estimates for the Federal Family Education Loan Program. We will not be satisfied with the financial management and program accountability in this department until we receive consistently unqualified audit opinions. The Department has also worked to improve management and delivery of federal student financial assistance, as described earlier in Objective 3.3.

Core Strategies

- **Centralized core data.**
  - Provide timely and reliable information to program offices to help them manage their programs through EDCAPS.
  - Continue to convert funds control system and processes to the EDCAPS environment to prevent unlawful expenditure of funds.
- **Performance-based contracting, reduced outsourcing.** Control costs by implementing performance-based contracting and by repatriating work contracted out when effective and possible within staff ceilings. Improve work statements and cost estimates through continued training and independent evaluations of content and organization that provide feedback on quality.
- **Financial integrity.** Enhance the Department's credibility by obtaining a clean audit opinion on annual financial statements.
- **Staff skills.** Provide training and incentives for both financial and program staff to acquire core financial management competencies.

Objective 4.7: All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven.

Performance Indicators

27. *Employees will recognize the strategic plan as meaningful and understand how their work supports achieving the plan's goals and objectives.*
28. *Senior leadership and managers' reviews of performance indicator data will result in appropriate follow-up actions.*
29. *Independent assessments will verify that all large and selected other ED programs have comprehensive, high-quality performance measurement systems that are used for program improvement and accountability by 2000.*
30. *By 2000 all ED program managers will assert that the data used for their program's performance measurement are reliable and valid or will have plans for improvement.*
31. *Managers will agree that policy, budget, and resource allocation decisions are aligned with the strategic priorities of the Department.*

The Government Performance and Results Act ("the Results Act") provides the Department with strong support and guidance for new ways of operating and improving our programs. Its focus on results affects all aspects of an organization and its operations—drafting legislation and regulations, ensuring program quality and financial integrity, conducting employee appraisals and assessment, measuring program performance, and more. Two critical elements in this process are:

- Developing strategic plans—agency-wide and for individual programs—to set forth our understanding of what we are to accomplish and how we know that we've succeeded.
- Establishing or improving performance measurement systems and evaluations that provide high-quality performance information on the results of our efforts and what is needed to improve.

When orienting our program management to focus on results, it is important to consider the specific context in which we carry out our mission. When carrying out its programs and policy initiatives, the Department operates in a broad, multi-level system of education providers and community interests. Program outcomes for education are almost always the joint results of state, local, institutional, and federal efforts, rather than of federal programs acting in isolation.

Core Strategies

- **Agency performance on strategic plan and program indicator plans**.
  - Track and give feedback on implementation of plans.
  - Provide a report card on overall agency performance as well as that of individual offices.
- **Collaboration with partners**. Actively involve our education partners in development and implementation of the strategic plan and program performance plans.
- **Performance measurement and evaluation.**
  - Ensure that key program activities are subject to periodic, high-quality performance measurement, ranging from meaningful, accurate grantee performance reports to independent evaluations and customer surveys.
  - Align program evaluations and national assessments to support the strategic plan and program performance plans.
  - Improve local grantee performance measurement systems through disseminating models, technical assistance, and legislative and regulatory changes.
  - Develop standards of successful performance for key processes and programs by 1999.
  - Revise managers' performance agreements so that they are rated on the quality of their program's or service's performance measures and, if needed, plans for improvement.
- **Analytic agenda.** Launch an analytic agenda for the Department's seven priority initiatives to improve the underlying knowledge base in support of the initiatives.
- **Budget priorities and allocations reflect strategic plan and annual performance plans.**
  - Establish annual budget priorities linked to federal and Department priorities.
  - Align resources to support the Department's strategic and annual plans.

Resources

The Department's success in achieving its goals and objectives will depend upon the resources available to support them. The Department is responsible for two types of program funding—(1) Congressional appropriations for its programs and services and (2) student loans provided by ED or guaranteed and provided by lending institutions. The key resources supporting our programs and leadership activities are program administration funds and staffing.

These resources are allocated towards meeting our goals as demonstrated in the following tables. While some of our programs are targeted at particular objectives, many programs support more than one objective (see the relationship chart starting on page 57). In particular, we have a number of major programs that support both Goals 1 and 2, such as Title I Grants for Disadvantaged Children. For that reason, the resources are grouped at the level of goals, and the resources supporting Goals 1 and 2 are aggregated in the table.

Distribution of total resources—budget authority for programs, new loans, and budget authority for administrative expenses

Table 1 below illustrates how the Department's total resources are allocated to the strategic plan goals. Some highlights include:

- "Program funding" includes (1) budget authority for the Department's programs such as Title I grants to local educational agencies and Pell Grants for postsecondary students and (2) estimated new student loans made during the year.

  Of the total program funding of $66.7 billion that the Department is overseeing in FY 1997, budget authority represents 48% ($32.0 billion) and new student loans represent 52% ($34.8 billion).

- The Department's program funding supports the strategic plan goals, as Table 1 shows. Program funding is distributed as follows:
  - Almost 25% supports elementary and secondary education programs
  - Almost 75% supports postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education programs and new student loans
  - Less than 1% supports research activities

- The majority of ED's administrative funding (salaries and expenses) supports postsecondary education programs, including administration of the Direct Loan program and major contracts for student loan processing:
  - 66% for postsecondary education
  - 15% for leadership, oversight, and operations
  - 7% for K-12 education
  - 7% for direct civil rights enforcement, technical assistance, and training
  - 5% for research

Table 1. Estimated Distribution of Funding and Staffing Resources to Strategic Plan Goals, based on FY 1997 budget authority and estimated new student loans

	"Program Funding"		Staffing (estimated FTE usage)		Administration Funding	
	Budget Authority/ Student Loans ($000s)	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Salaries & Expenses[1] ($000s)	Percent of Total
Goal 1 and Goal 2 *(ED's K-12 education programs)*						
ED's K-12 programs	$16,383,088[1]	24.6%	577	12.9%	$60,519	7.5%
Goal 3 *(postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education)*						
Postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education programs, and student loans	15,160,792[1] 34,764,000[2] $49,924,792	74.8%	1,875	42.0%	$529,589	65.6%
Goal 4 *(research, leadership/oversight/operations)*						
Research *(OERI, NIDRR, IDEA Research to Practice, FIPSE)*[3]	$427,451[1]	0.6%	387	8.6%	$44,098	5.5%
Leadership/oversight/ operations[4]	$0	—	947	21.2%	$118,414	14.7%
Civil Rights, direct support[5]						
Office of Civil Rights, Title IV Training and Advisory Services, Women's Educational Equity	$9,334[1]	0.0%	682	15.3%	$55,112	6.8%
Total resources	$66,744,655	100.0%	4,468	100.0%	$807,732	100.0%

Distribution of administrative funds

In FY 1997, administrative funds ($807.7 million) represent 2.5% of ED's budget authority but—in a more accurate reflection of ED's responsibilities—1.2% of all program funding, including new student loans. Table 2 categorizes the Department's administrative funding by type of activity. Administrative

[1] Budget authority (Congressional appropriations).

[2] New student loans made by the Department or banks.

[3] Acronyms are OERI (Office of Educational Research and Improvement), NIDRR (National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research), IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), and FIPSE (Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education).

[4] Leadership, oversight, and operations includes the Offices of the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Budget and Planning and Evaluation Services, Inspector General, General Counsel, Chief Information Officer, Chief Financial Officer, Legislation, Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs, and Management.

[5] Civil Rights direct support includes the Office for Civil Rights and the Title IV (Civil Right Act) Training and Advisory Assistance and Women's Educational Equity programs.

funds are used for salaries, contracts, and other expenses (such as rent, telephones, equipment and supplies).

ED's administrative funds are used for:

- *Contracts with private sector organizations* (40.4% of total administration funds). Most of this funding supports the delivery of student financial aid, including processing student loan applications and maintaining data on student loans
- *Staff salaries* (37%)
- *Other expenses,* such as rent, telephones, equipment and supplies, travel, etc. (19%)

Table 2. Estimated Distribution of Program Administration Funds by Goal and Type of Activity

	FY 1997 Salaries & Expenses ($000s)	Percent of Total
Goal 1 and Goal 2 *(ED's K-12 education programs)*		
Salaries	$41,092	5.0%
Contracts	$5,000	0.6%
Other	$14,427	1.8%
Subtotal	*$60,519*	*7.4%*
Goal 3 *(postsecondary, vocational rehabilitation, and adult education)*		
Salaries	$120,618	14.9%
Contracts	$325,950	40.4%
Other	$83,021	10.3%
Subtotal	*$529,589*	*65.6%*
Goal 4 *(research, leadership/oversight/operations)*		
Research		
Salaries	$29,953	3.7%
Contracts	$4,129	0.5%
Other	$10,016	1.2%
Subtotal	*$44,098*	*5.4%*
Leadership/oversight/ operations	$65,789	8.1%
Salaries	$18,824	2.4%
Contracts	$33,801	4.2%
Other	*$118,414*	*14.7%*
Subtotal		
Civil Rights, direct support		
Salaries	$44,389	5.5%
Contracts	$1,412	0.2%
Other	$9,311	1.2%
Subtotal	*$55,112*	*6.9%*
Totals, by category		
Salaries	$301,841	37.4%
Contracts	$355,315	44.0%
Other	$150,576	18.6%
Total S&E funding	**$807,732**	**100.0%**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Relationship of Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives to Program Goals

The Department is committed to being held accountable for measuring and reporting results on our goals and objectives. The annual performance plan will be one tool for setting goals, tracking progress, and identifying areas for improvement. The annual plan will be constructed from the budget justifications and program performance indicator plans for all our programs. Like the strategic plan, the individual program performance plans lay out goals, objectives, performance indicators and targets, data sources, and key strategies for all programs in the Department. They are directly linked to the Department's budget for each program area. In some cases, several budget line items have been aggregated into a single performance plan. The individual programs are separately identifiable, however, with at least one objective specified for each.

The annual plan—budget and program performance plans—will identify where they relate to this strategic plan. In addition, the relationship goes both ways. This strategic plan is based, in part, on objectives and indicators in draft program performance plans prepared for our key programs in winter 1997.

The following table links the Department's programs to the objectives in this strategic plan. It is intended to show where programs have a significant amount of activities or products supporting an objective.

Table 3, Part 1
Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

	FY 1997 Appropriation ($000s)	$476,000	$15,000	$199,973	$256,965	$7,336,351	$101,992	$305,473	$39,311	$6,977	$9,469	$730,000	$310,000	$310,000	$555,978	$10,265	$9,000	$95,000	$25,000	$2,000	$7,334	$1,500	$15,000	$8,000	$50,987	$25,554
		Goals 2000 grants to states	Goals 2000 parental assistance	School-to-work opportunities	Technology challenge (fund/grants)	Title I grants to local ed. agencies	Even Start	Title I migrant education	Title I neglected and delinquent	Title I evaluation	Migrant education (HEP and CAMP)	Impact Aid	Eisenhower prof. dev. state grants	Innovative strategies state grants	Safe and drug-free schools	Inexpensive book distribution	Arts in education	Magnet schools assistance	Ed. for homeless children and youth	Women's educational equity	Title IV-CRA trng./advisory services	Ellender fellowships	Education for Native Hawaiians	Alaska Native education equity	Charter schools	Comp. regional assistance centers
Goal 1: K-12 education system																										
1.1	States develop and implement standards	X		X		X																				X
1.2	School to work			X																						
1.3	Strong, safe and drug-free schools											X			X											X
1.4	Talented and dedicated teachers					X							X	X								X				X
1.5	Families and communities		X			X	X								X	X			X				X	X		X
1.6	Public school choice																	X			X				X	X
1.7	Technology	X			X									X												X
Goal 2: A solid foundation for all students																										
2.1	All children ready to learn	X	X			X	X									X							X	X		X
2.2	Third grade reading	X			X	X	X	X								X		X								X
2.3	Eighth grade math	X			X	X		X	X				X					X								X
2.4	Special populations help				X	X	X	X	X		X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																										
3.1	Secondary students--information & support										X															
3.2	Postsecondary students--fin. aid & support										X															
3.4	Lifelong learning																									
Goal 4: High-performance organization																										
4.3	Research, evaluation and improvement									X																
Civil rights, direct support																				X	X					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3, Part 2
Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

	FY 1997 Appropriation ($000s)	$58,050	$156,700	$5,000	$100,000	$3,109,395	$360,409	$315,754	$26,988	$97,140	$80,735	$15,535	$30,023	$2,164,038	$12,000	$10,392	$39,629	$18,942	$1,850	$2,596	$7,657	$22,071	$38,152	$74,687	$2,391	$1,587
		Indian education	Bilingual education	Foreign language assistance	Immigrant education	IDEA special ed. state grants (Part B)	IDEA preschool grants (Part B)	IDEA infants and families (Part H)	IDEA State improvement	IDEA research to practice	IDEA personnel preparation	IDEA parent information centers	IDEA technology and media services	Vocational rehab. (VR) state grants	VR grants for Indians	VR client assistance State grants	VR training	VR special demonstration programs	VR migratory workers	VR recreational programs	VR protect./advoc. indiv. rights	VR projects with industry	VR supported employmt. state grants	VR independent living	VR program improvement	VR evaluation
Goal 1: K-12 education system																										
1.1	States develop and implement standards																									
1.2	School to work													X	X											
1.3	Strong, safe and drug-free schools																									
1.4	Talented and dedicated teachers		X	X					X		X															
1.5	Families and communities	X	X			X	X	X				X														
1.6	Public school choice																									
1.7	Technology												X													
Goal 2: A solid foundation for all students																										
2.1	All children ready to learn					X	X	X				X														
2.2	Third grade reading	X	X			X	X	X																		
2.3	Eighth grade math	X	X			X																				
2.4	Special populations help	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X										
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																										
3.1	Secondary students--information & support																									
3.2	Postsecondary students--fin. aid & support													X												
3.4	Lifelong learning													X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Goal 4: High-performance organization																										
4.3	Research, evaluation and improvement									X															X	X
Civil rights, direct support																X					X			X		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3, Part 3
Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

		FY 1997 Appropriation ($000s)	$7,337	$69,990	$36,109	$6,680	$43,041	$79,182	$1,115,550	$13,497	$2,919	$345,337	$4,491	$4,723	$5,919,000	$1,591,407	$50,000	$3,171,260	$372,694	$194,846	$18,000	$2,212	$5,255	$59,751	$9,200	$15,673	$3,000
			Helen Keller National Center	NIDRR	Assistive technology	American Printing House for the Blind	Natl. Technical Institute for the Deaf	Gallaudet University	Vocational education State grants	Vocational education natl. programs	Tribally control. postsec. voc. instit.	Adult ed. (grants, eval., tech. assist.)	National Institute for Literacy	Literacy programs for prisoners	Pell grants	Campus-based programs	State student incentive grants	Federal Family Education Loans	Direct Student Loans	Aid for institutional development	Fund for Improvement of Postsec. Ed.	Minority teacher recruitment	Minority science improvement	Int. ed., foreign lang. studies	Urban community service	Interest subsidy grants	Pell Inst. for Int. Rel. & Public Policy
Goal 1: K-12 education system																											
1.1	States develop and implement standards			X																							
1.2	School to work								X	X																	
1.3	Strong, safe and drug-free schools																										
1.4	Talented and dedicated teachers	X	X																			X			X		
1.5	Families and communities	X	X																								
1.6	Public school choice																										
1.7	Technology		X	X																					X		
Goal 2: A solid foundation for all students																											
2.1	All children ready to learn					X																					
2.2	Third grade reading					X																					
2.3	Eighth grade math					X																					
2.4	Special populations help	X	X	X	X			X																			
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																											
3.1	Secondary students--information & support				X	X	X	X															X				
3.2	Postsecondary students--fin. aid & support					X	X			X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
3.4	Lifelong learning		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X													
Goal 4: High-performance organization																											
4.3	Research, evaluation and improvement	X	X						X			X								X			X			
Civil rights, direct support			X																								

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3, Part 4
Support for Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives by Department of Education Programs

		FY 1997 Appropriation ($000s)	$499,994	$3,600	$29,117	$3,000	$5,931	$24,069	$196,000	$54,000	$51,000	$18,567	$79,752	$13,342	$10,000	$30,000	$7,000	$1,035	$40,000	$5,000	$15,000	$1,000	$3,100	$4,500	$5,000	$54,900
			TRIO programs	Natl. early intervention scholarships	Byrd honors scholarships	George Bush fellowships	Javits fellowships	Graduate assistance in national need	Howard University	National education research institutes	Regional educational laboratories	National dissemination activities	Statistics and assessment	Eisenhower prof. dev. federal	Regional technology in education	Star schools	Ready to learn television	Telecommunications math	Fund for Improvement of Education	Javits gifted and talented education	Eisenhower reg. math/sci. consortia	Learning centers	National writing project	Civic education	Internatl. ed. exchange (Goals 2000)	Office for Civil Rights
Goal 1: K-12 education system																										
1.1	States develop and implement standards								X	X	X	X	X	X				X		X		X	X	X	
1.2	School to work								X			X														
1.3	Strong, safe and drug-free schools											X									X					
1.4	Talented and dedicated teachers								X	X		X	X	X	X		X			X						
1.5	Families and communities	X								X		X				X										
1.6	Public school choice											X														
1.7	Technology									X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X						
Goal 2: A solid foundation for all students																										
2.1	All children ready to learn								X	X		X				X					X				X
2.2	Third grade reading								X	X		X				X		X	X		X				X
2.3	Eighth grade math								X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X				X
2.4	Special populations help	X							X	X		X			X	X			X				X		X
Goal 3: Postsecondary education and lifelong learning																										
3.1	Secondary students--information & support	X	X									X														
3.2	Postsecondary students--fin. aid & support	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X														X
3.4	Lifelong learning								X			X														X
Goal 4: High-performance organization																										
4.3	Research, evaluation and improvement								X	X	X	X	X	X				X								
Civil rights, direct support												X														X

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Key External Factors that Could Affect Achievement of ED's Goals and Objectives

Although the Department's plan is predicated upon partnerships with state and local education agencies, public and private postsecondary education institutions, and financial institutions to achieve its mission of education quality and access, some factors are largely outside the scope of this joint partnership for learning. These external factors include:

Effects from an economic downturn.

- Declines in state and local school tax revenues would affect their ability to serve growing enrollments from the baby-boom echo as well as implement needed education reforms.
- Postsecondary enrollments often rise during downturns, requiring additional funding resources.
- Tuition cost increases affect student loan and grant requirements.
- Student loan defaults go up during recessions, when graduates lose jobs or are unable to find jobs.
- Higher interest rates increase costs to students for their student loans.

> *Departmental response: Consider increases in federal elementary and secondary education funding supporting expanded program needs generated from growing student enrollments. At the postsecondary level, the Department will continue to strengthen its information to students about flexible repayment options and its gatekeeping oversight, particularly during periods of economic slowdown or downturn.*

Actions by individual families critical to education, especially early learning. The Department is limited in its ability to provide information to families. As a consequence, many families may not understand their role in their children's learning, particularly during the important early years of life, which new brain research finds is critical to future intellectual development.

> *Departmental response: Expand family involvement outreach strategies through the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education and federal programs reaching young children to inform families of the importance of early learning.*

State capacity and willingness to implement challenging standards. It is ultimately a state decision to adopt and support challenging standards. States and communities need to continue to establish and be held accountable for high academic standards, even where these standards are initially very tough for a significant proportion of their students to meet.

> *Departmental response: Use federal leadership and recognition to reinforce state efforts in setting high standards. Encourage state participation in voluntary, Department-sponsored national tests that could provide them with uniform benchmarks to reinforce challenging state standards.*

Local schools' capacity to invest in long-term improvements. School systems, under pressure to demonstrate short-term gains, may not make long-term investments. Yet, for the new and demanding reforms to succeed, school systems will need to undertake long-term investment in professional development and other capacity building activities.

> *Departmental response: Work with program and technical assistance providers to highlight the importance of sustained professional development aligned with standards. In addition, the Department will emphasize the importance of professional development in its performance indicators.*

American society's tolerance for drug and alcohol use. Widespread social tolerance for drug and alcohol use is a countervailing influence to prevention activities by schools and educators who receive federal assistance for drug-education and prevention activities.

> *Departmental response: Work with others in the Administration to develop and disseminate the best information available on effective intervention strategies and use the visibility of federal leadership to discourage tolerance for drug use.*

Other social supports for disadvantaged children and families. At the federal level, many social services supporting children and youth fall largely outside the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. The Department has limited ability to reinforce education reforms in high-risk communities through improved opportunities for low income children in health care, recreation and safe and drug-free environments.

> *Departmental response: Actively coordinate programs and activities with other federal agencies providing related services to children and youth.*

Business community's support for education, particularly school-to-work. Short-term economic considerations may limit the willingness of employers to support Departmental efforts by undertaking effective school-to-work partnerships and linking hiring with a student's education achievement.

> *Departmental response: Persuade employers to build a stronger workforce through supporting high-quality school-to-work activities, including meaningful work experiences. Support efforts to provide employers with access to objective student performance information.*

Program Evaluations and Other Studies

The Department's Planning and Evaluation Service coordinates evaluation activities to provide valid and reliable information for performance measurement in this plan. In addition, the Department and other federal agencies fund a variety of assessments, statistical studies, and grantee performance data systems that provide information useful for this plan. This section provides an overview of the evaluations and coordination activities critical to effective data use. Detailed information on the performance indicators, including data sources and examples of baseline or related data is provided in Appendix A (starting on page 71). Descriptions of the program evaluations, national statistical studies and assessments, and grantee performance data systems supporting this plan are provided in Appendix B (starting on page 97).

Evaluation Strategies

Examples of existing or planned evaluation and assessment strategies to provide sound performance measurement through program evaluation include:

- Systematic collection of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary student outcome data using federal and state statistical sources. *(National Assessment of Educational Progress; National Postsecondary Student Aid Study; Department of Labor's National Longitudinal Study of Youth)*

- Wider use of customer surveys. *(National Direct Student Loan Program Evaluation)*

- Expert reviews of the quality of Department-funded research, development, and program improvement programs and products. *(Evaluation of the Regional Education Labs)*

- Impact evaluations using time-series design or experimental design (random assignment/control group methodology) to provide comparative information on program effectiveness and to help identify "what works." *(Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance; Evaluation of the TRIO Upward Bound program; National Evaluation of the School-to-Work Program; Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs)*

- Program evaluation guidance and assistance to program office staff and grantees to improve the reporting and use of sound program information. *(Guide to Program Outcome Measurement for the U.S. Department of Education; Title I Parent Compact Guide)*

- Increased use of management evaluations, such as ones planned on the Department's new performance appraisal system, the human resource re-engineering, and the flexiplace system.

Data Coordination and Burden Reduction

The Department is also taking steps to ensure that evaluations and performance measurement avoid data duplication and meet high standards of data quality.

Internal coordination. Several initiatives for internal coordination are underway. Two key ones include:

- *Cross-office coordination of data.* In 1996, the Department established the Data Coordination Committee reporting to the Deputy Secretary with representatives from all offices. Its mission is to review and resolve data quality, burden, and duplication issues. The committee also works with key partners such as state education agencies in this process.

- *Staff reviews of performance indicators.* Under the leadership of the Deputy Secretary, three Department offices—the Planning and Evaluation Service, Budget Service, and National Center for Educational Statistics—are working collaboratively to review program performance indicators with the responsible program offices for content, methodology, and quality of data sources.

Coordination with other federal agencies. Program offices have worked with evaluation and statistics agencies in other federal departments—for example, using the Department of Health and Human Services' Monitoring the Future survey for data useful for drug prevention, the National Science Foundation's data on minority participation in science and engineering, and Labor's National Longitudinal Study of Youth for school to work and other topics involving youth follow-up.

ED's Inspector General. The Inspector General will be conducting independent reviews of the reliability and validity of selected performance measures.

Examples of Program Evaluations

The Department has an active evaluation program involving several offices and coordinated by the Planning and Evaluation Service. Most current evaluations relate closely to the goals and objectives of this plan. Future ones will align even more closely and will fill in knowledge gaps where possible. In addition, data from national assessments, in particular the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and national statistical studies are key sources for strategic directions and indicator data.

For more detailed descriptions of the evaluations, statistical studies, assessments, and other data systems that support the goals, objectives, and indicators of this plan, see Appendix B (page 97).

Program evaluations that support this plan include:

Goals 1 and 2 (K-12) Outcome Indicators

- Special analyses of data from the **National Assessment of Educational Progress** on the progress of Title I and high-poverty schools and disadvantaged students relative to the nation.
- **Analyses of annual state and local performance reports** on student results from state and local assessments.
- Assessment information through the **Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance**, supplemented with data from the **Longitudinal Survey of School Implementation of Standards-Based Reform and Title I.**

Goal 1: Helping All Students Achieve to Challenging Standards.

- **Crosscutting Evaluation of Federal Efforts to Assist in School Reform**, which will provide baseline indicators of the planning process and early implementation of standards development and key provisions in federal programs, including awareness, problems encountered, and assistance and support from Goals 2000, Title I and other sources.
- **Targeting and Resource Allocation Study,** which will examine how federal resources from Goals 2000 and Elementary and Secondary Education Act grants are used at the school and district levels to support legislative objectives.
- **National Evaluation of School-to-Work Systems**, a five-year study, that is determining whether school-to-work is a viable long-term educational strategy that is accessible to all students.
- **Study of Local Educational Agency Activities under the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA),** which will collect information on local policy development, planning, implementation, and evaluation of SDFSCA activities, including progress in achieving measurable goals and objectives and in using research-based approaches.
- **Study on School Violence and Prevention: Evaluation of Promising Programs,** which will report on disorder and violence in schools nationally, the effectiveness of promising approaches to preventing violence in schools, and distinguishing characteristics of safe schools in various locales.

- **Evaluation of Title II Professional Development,** which is examining the quality of professional development supported by the Title II Eisenhower Program, its alignment with broader reform efforts, and its impact on teachers' classroom practice.
- **Evaluation of the Charter Schools Program**, a new study planned for FY 1998, that will track the effects of federally supported charter schools on increasing school flexibility and performance accountability for meeting state content and performance standards.
- **Evaluations of federal support for technology** will examine the extent to which federal programs are promoting access to and effective use of modern technology that is supportive of challenging curriculum and instruction and the potential for well-implemented technology to improve learning.

Goal 2. Build a Solid Foundation for Learning for All Children.

- **Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance**, which is assessing the extent to which systemic reform can work for all children when properly implemented. It will analyze how curriculum and instruction are changing in leading reform states and the impact in Title I schools.
- **Longitudinal Survey of Schools,** a study that includes special samples of schools that serve large concentrations of limited English proficient, migrant, and Native American students.
- **National Evaluation of Even Start,** which documents how these intergenerational literacy projects operate; progress and outcomes for families—including the readiness of young children for school; and promising practices that may be used for program improvement.

Goal 3. Ensure Access to Postsecondary Education and Lifelong Learning.

- **Upward Bound Evaluation,** a random assignment evaluation designed to assess effects of Upward Bound on students' preparation for college, high school graduation, college entry and achievement.
- **College preparation studies,** a set of related research studies, focus groups, and surveys to help formulate the national campaign aimed at encouraging middle-school students and their parents to prepare for college.
- **Secondary data analyses of the effects of student aid programs,** that analyze NCES and Census data to assess the targeting of aid, maintaining affordability to postsecondary education, and equalizing educational attainment across income groups.
- **Student Support Services Evaluation,** a longitudinal evaluation assessing the effects of TRIO's Student Support Services program on college retention and graduation, grades, and transfer behavior from 2-year to 4-year institutions.
- **Title III Performance Measurement Study,** a study to develop a system of performance indicators for judging the success of the Title III Strengthening Developing Institutions programs.
- **Direct Loan Evaluation**, a comprehensive evaluation of management outcomes (institutional, student, and parent satisfaction; operational efficiency; and Departmental support).
- **Customer satisfaction surveys**, surveys of postsecondary institutions and students satisfaction with the operation and delivery of the student aid programs.
- **Gatekeeping studies**, a set of studies examining how various components of the gatekeeping process—e.g., accreditation, state licensure, outcome reporting—are functioning.
- **"What Works" Study for Adult English as a Second Language (ESL) Students,** a comparative evaluation of which instructional practices are most effective for adult ESL students who have low native-language literacy and a description of adult ESL at the classroom and program levels in the six states that comprise more than 75% of all ESL enrollments.
- **Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs and Practices,** a study that is identifying and validating the key elements of effective programs for low-literate learners.
- **Longitudinal Study of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service Program,** a study of outcomes achieved by rehabilitation services consumers and the extent of return on the program's investment.

Development of the Plan

Drafting the Plan

The Department of Education first developed a strategic plan in 1994. That plan started the transformation of the Department into a high performance organization, and gave us experience at both developing plans and in using a plan to track implementation of key priorities. This new strategic plan builds on our first plan, incorporating new policy directions from the Department's leadership and findings from a variety of supporting documents, including:

- President Clinton's Call to Action for American Education
- Secretary Riley's Seven Priorities for the Department of Education
- An update to the Department's first plan prepared by Department assistant secretaries
- Program indicator plans developed by most major programs in the Department
- Several reports by the General Accounting Office (GAO) on further management reforms needed
- FY 1993 and 1996 employee surveys
- A variety of program evaluations, assessments, and statistical reports

During the spring and summer of 1997, drafts of this plan were prepared and circulated within the Department widely. Meetings were held with the Labor-Management Partnership to receive feedback on the plan. Assistant secretaries were asked to meet with their staffs to discuss the plan, obtain ideas for changes, and also begin to discuss how the plan would be implemented by their offices. The Deputy Secretary personally reviewed the plan in detail and approved substantive changes. ***At no time was any contractor involved in the drafting or other development of this plan.***

Consultations

The Department consulted extensively with outside interested parties on this strategic plan, and made changes as a result of those consultations. Even where we did not make changes, we distributed the comments to appropriate offices to take into account when administering programs and new initiatives.

- ***Congress.*** The Department provided copies of the draft strategic plan to Congressional authorizing, appropriations, budget, and government operations committees—House and Senate, majority and minority staffs. We met with staff from the House appropriations, authorizing, budget, and government operations committees, as well as Senate authorizing and budget committee staff.

  In addition to comments received during the meetings, House Congressional staff provided us their "Interim Evaluation" of the Department's draft strategic plans (the "Scorecard"). We also received letters with helpful comments from senior members of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce—from Committee Chairman Bill Goodling and ranking minority member William Clay and from Peter Hoekstra, subcommittee chairman for Oversight and Investigations.

- ***General Accounting Office (GAO).*** A letter report reviewing the strategic plan provided valuable insight and helped to identify major areas for improvement.

- ***Stakeholders.*** The Department's stakeholders include all members of the education community—state and local governments, school districts, and postsecondary institutions. Requesting comments and suggestions for improvement, the Department mailed the draft strategic plan to more than 100 key stakeholder organizations, including education, community, civil rights, general government, and business organizations interested in education.

In addition, many assistant secretaries and heads of major program offices discussed draft program-level performance indicator plans with their grantees and stakeholder groups. A few examples include:

- The assistant secretary for vocational and adult education shared the vocational education and adult education plans with state directors to get feedback and suggestions for improvement.
- The director for bilingual education and minority language affairs presented the draft bilingual education performance indicator plan to the annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education. There was a standing-room-only turnout—the field was very interested in the indicator plan—and a positive response overall.
- The assistant secretary for postsecondary education has shared and discussed the set of postsecondary student financial aid indicator plans at regular meetings with key stakeholders.

- ***ED Internet home page.*** The Department's world wide web pages provide the entire strategic plan in HTML and .PDF formats (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/StratPln98/) and offer the opportunity to comment electronically to strategic_plan@ ed.gov or by letter or fax. The Department received several comments from members of the public.

- ***Other federal agencies.*** The Department consulted with relevant federal agencies on our respective strategic plans, including the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Treasury; the National Science Foundation; the Social Security Administration; and the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

- ***Office of Management and Budget.*** The Department held meetings and discussions with OMB staff and provided drafts for OMB review, receiving helpful written comments.

- ***Council for Excellence in Government.*** The Department of Education was one of several agencies selected by the Council for review, receiving helpful written comments.

Appendices A and B

A: Supplemental Information on Performance Indicators

B: Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

Acronyms

For federal agencies and U.S. Department of Education offices mentioned in Appendices A and B.

Agencies:

ED	Department of Education
DOL	Department of Labor
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
NSF	National Science Foundation

ED offices:

PES	Planning and Evaluation Service
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
OERI	Office of Educational Research and Improvement
OBEMLA	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs
OESE	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
OPE	Office of Postsecondary Education
OSERS	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
OVAE	Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Appendix A: Supplemental Information on Performance Indicators

This section lists all strategic plan performance indicators in the order they are in the strategic plan; identifies current or planned data sources; and provides examples of baseline data—or, if baselines are not available, related data that may inform the issue. Where data sources have not been specified, the Department will work during the next year to set up new data collections or redirect current ones to provide data for all indicators in the plan.

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goals 1 and 2: K-12 key outcome indicators			
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment. **Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.**	1. Increasing percentages of all students will meet or exceed basic, proficient, and advanced performance levels in national and state assessments of reading, math, and other core subjects.	• *60% of 4th-graders, 70% of 8th-graders, and 75% of 12th-graders scored at or above the basic level in reading in 1994. (National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1994)* • *64% of 4th-graders, 62% of 8th-graders, and 69% of 12th-graders scored at or above the basic level in mathematics in 1996. (NAEP, 1996)*	• National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Reading, biennial, 1996 • NAEP Math, biennial, 1998 • State Assessments, annual
	2. Students in high-poverty schools will show continuous improvement in achieving proficiency levels comparable to those for the nation.	• *32% of 4th-graders from families with low educational attainment scored at least at the basic proficiency level in reading compared to 70% of children with college-graduate parents. (NAEP, 1994)* • *39% of low-income 8th-graders scored at least basic proficiency in mathematics compared to 71% of other 8th-graders. (NAEP, 1996)*	• NAEP Reading, biennial, 1996 • NAEP Math, biennial, 1998
	3. High school attendance and graduation rates will continually improve—particularly in high-poverty schools and among students with disabilities and others at risk of school failure.	• *Children from poor families were three times more likely to drop out of high school than other children. (Dropout Rates in the United States, 1993)*	• U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Survey, annual • Common Core of Data surveys, annual • Analysis of National Education Longitudinal Study Data and Beginning Postsecondary Students Study Data, 1998
	4. The proportion of high school graduates, including vocational concentrators, who complete at least three years of science and three years of math will increase 10% between 1996 and 2000.	• *In 1994, 51% of all high school graduates took at least three years of science and three years of math. (Condition of Education, 1996)* • *Baseline data for 1996 high school graduates in School to Work systems is currently being collected.*	• High School Transcripts Study: Changes in math-science course-taking to be measured from transcripts collected for high school graduates, 1998
	5. Increasing numbers of high school students will successfully complete advanced placement courses each year.	• *83 out of 1,000 11th and 12th grade students in 1996 received passing scores on Advanced Placement (AP) exams. (The College Board—AP, 1996)*	• The College Board—AP, annual

75

76

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	6. Students in high-poverty schools will show comparable increases in completion of challenging course work—including advanced placement courses—that will enable them to pursue higher education or other options.	• *Baseline under development.*	• National Longitudinal Study of Youth, 1998-2000
	7. Increasing percentages of high school graduates will successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.	• *Baseline under development.*	• National Longitudinal Study of Youth, 1998-2000 • Additional data sources to be determined
Goal 1. Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.			
1.1 States develop challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects.	8. By the end of the 1997-98 school year, all states will have challenging content and performance standards in place for two or more core subjects.	• *33 states report content standards in 2 or more core subjects. (CCSSO, 1996)* • *22 states report performance standards in 2 or more core subjects. (CCSSO, 1996)* • *29 states have been assessed by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) as having standards in at least 3 core subjects that are clear, specific and well-grounded in content. (AFT, 1997)* • *An independent, expert panel found that math and/or science curriculum frameworks documents from six states (out of nine states reviewed) had many high quality characteristics, including reflecting the influence of the national standards.*	• Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), annual, 1997-2002 • Goals 2000 Annual Reports, 1997-2002 • Baseline State Survey, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997 • American Federation of Teachers, 1997 • Eisenhower State Curriculum Frameworks Evaluation, 1997
	9. By 2001 all states will have assessments aligned to challenging content and performance standards for two or more core subjects.	• *23 states report assessments aligned with content standards, curriculum frameworks, or state goals. (CCSSO, 1996)* • *Analysis of state assessment results against National Assessment of Educational Progress state results reveals wide discrepancy in how proficiency is defined by several states. (Southern Regional Education Board, 1996)*	• Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), annual, 1997-2002 • NAEP/State analysis, Planning and Evaluation Service, 1997

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	10. By 2002 increasing percentages of the general public and parents will be aware of the importance of challenging academic standards for all children, including at least the majority of parents from low-income families.	• *82% of the general public supports setting up clear guidelines for what students should learn and teachers should teach in every major subject. (Public opinion poll, 1994 & 1996)* • *61% of Americans say academic standards are too low in their own local schools. (Public opinion poll, 1996)* • *33% of public supports raising academic standards much higher, 42% say somewhat higher. (Public opinion poll, 1996)*	• Public opinion polls dependent on private funding, unless Department supports
1.2 Every state has a school-to-work (STW) system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.	11. Increasing percentages of high school graduates from school-to-work systems or from vocational concentrations will successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military.	• *Baseline data for 1996 high school graduates are being collected.*	• National Evaluation of School-to-Work, 1998 and 2000 cohorts
	12. Increasing percentages of employers will be highly satisfied with the productivity and work-readiness skills of graduates from school-to-work systems or vocational concentrations.	• *Baseline under development.*	• National Employer Survey, 1999
	13. By fall 2000, the percentage of high school students passing industry-recognized tests on technical skills will increase by at least 10%.	• *2.4% of high school seniors in communities with school-to-work partnerships. (National Evaluation of School-to-Work, 1995-96)*	• National Evaluation of School-to-Work, Survey of Local Partnerships, 1997 and 1999
	14. Two million youth will be engaged actively in school-to-work systems by fall 2000.	• *One million high school youth participated in 1996. (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)*	• STW progress measures for 1997-2000
	15. By 2000 an increasing percentage of secondary schools will provide opportunities for students to achieve industry-recognized skill standards.	• *12.9% of schools currently. (National Evaluation of School-to-Work, 1995-96)*	• National Evaluation of School-to-Work, Survey of Local Partnerships, 1997 and 1999

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	16. Thirty percent of high schools will have key school-to-work system components in place by fall 2000.	• *59% of participating high schools had classes in which academic and work related curriculum are integrated. (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)* • *51% of high schools in participating local partnerships had classes in which work-based learning was connected to school curriculum. (STW Progress Measures, June 1996)*	• STW progress measures, collected annually
	17. All youths with disabilities age 14 and older will have Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) that include a statement of transition service needs that will help focus on courses of study.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Program monitoring reports, ongoing
1.3 Schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free.	18. Recent increasing rates of alcohol and drug use (alcohol, marijuana, tobacco) among school-age children will slow and begin to fall by 2000.	• *Annual use of marijuana: 8th grade, 7%; 10th grade, 15%; 12th grade, 22%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992)* • *Annual use of alcohol: 45%, 8th grade; 63%, 10th grade; 73%, 12th grade. (Monitoring the Future, 1993)*	• Monitoring the Future, annual
	19. Rates of alcohol and drug use in schools will slow and begin to fall by 2000.	• *Use of marijuana in school, past year: 8th grade, 3%; 10th grade, 5%; 12th grade, 5%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992)* • *Use of alcohol in school, past year: 8th grade, 4%; 10th grade, 7%; 12th grade, 7%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992)* • *Use of cigarettes or chewing tobacco in school, past 30 days: 8th grade, 7%; 10th grade, 13%; 12th grade, 14%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992).*	• Monitoring the Future, annual
	20. The number of criminal and violent incidents in schools by students will continually decrease between now and 2002.	• *12th-graders injured with a weapon: 5%. (Monitoring the Future, 1993)* • *12th-graders who had something stolen: 41%. (Monitoring the Future, 1993)*	• National Crime Victimization Survey, 1999, triennial • Monitoring the Future, annual • Fast Response Survey, 1997

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	21. The percentage of students reporting tolerant attitudes toward drug and alcohol use will decline significantly between now and 2002.	• *Disapprove of trying marijuana: 8th grade, 82%; 10th grade, 75%; 12th grade, 70%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992)* • *Disapprove of trying alcohol: 8th grade, 52%; 10th grade, 40%; 12th grade, 33%. (Monitoring the Future, 1992)* *Note: youth attitudes toward drug use are a strong predictor of changes in actual drug use.*	• Monitoring the Future, annual
	22. By 1999 all local educational agencies participating in the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program will use prevention programs based on the Department's principles of effectiveness.	• *Under SDFSA grants, there is widespread use of programs that research has not shown to be effective.*	• Survey, to be developed by the Planning and Evaluation Service, 1998
	23. By 1999 all states will conduct periodic statewide surveys or collect statewide data on alcohol and drug use of students and incidents of crime and violence in schools.	• *In 1995, 24 states and territories that participated in the Youth Risk Behavior Survey had data representative for the state. (ED/Safe and Drug Free Schools Act Survey, 1997)*	• ED/Safe and Drug Free Schools Act Performance Report, annual
	24. The percentage of teachers who are trained to deal with discipline problems in the classroom will increase significantly by 2000.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000
1.4 A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.	25. The percentage of teachers and principals across the nation who are rated by supervisors, parents, and peers as very effective will increase annually.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Survey, to be developed by the Planning and Evaluation Service, 1998 • Other data sources to be determined
	26. Throughout the nation the percentage of secondary school teachers who have at least a minor in the subject they teach will increase annually.	• *23% of teachers do not have at least a minor in their main teaching field. (Schools and Staffing Survey, 1990-91).*	• Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000
	27. The percentage of qualified new teachers who leave the profession within the first 3 years will continuously decrease.	• *22% of beginning teachers drop out of the teaching profession within the first three years. (Teacher Follow-up Survey, 1994-95)*	• Teacher Follow Up Survey from Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	28. The number of nationally board certified teachers will increase to reach 105,000 by 2006.	• *In 1996, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future set a goal of certifying 105,000 teachers within ten years, one for every school in the nation. Approximately 600 teachers were nationally-board certified as of summer 1997. (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1997)*	• National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, annual
	29. By 2002, 75% of states will align initial teacher certification standards with high content and student performance standards.	• *From 15-20 states are actively involved in reforming teacher education licensure. (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Survey, 1995; Teacher Education Survey, 1995; personal communication with AACTE, 1996)*	• Surveys by national organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers—State Policies and Practices Survey, every 2 years, next in January, 1998; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE); and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
1.5 Families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts.	30. The percentage of students who come to school prepared for learning and having completed their homework, as rated by their teachers, will increase substantially over the next five years, especially among children from low-income families.	• *34% of Chapter I Students are rated "high" by their teachers on completing homework assignments. By comparison, 53% of students overall are rated high. (Prospects Interim Report, 1993)* • *Teachers indicate that 12% of their Chapter 1 students and 7% of their non-Chapter 1 students have absenteeism problems. Teachers indicate that 15% of their Chapter 1 students and 9% of their non-Chapter 1 students get inadequate rest. Teachers indicate that 21% of their Chapter 1 students and 17% of their non-Chapter 1 students have hygiene problems. (Prospects Interim Report, 1993)*	• Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 • Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998 • National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	31. The percentage of young children who read regularly at home with their parents and on their own (at least 15 minutes a day, five days a week) will increase to 90% by 2002.	• *52% of parents of K-6 students indicate they read to or with their child almost every day (NHES 1993, 1995, in 1995 Goals Report).* • *72% of parents whose children are ages 3-5 indicate they read to their children or tell them stories regularly. (Institute for Educational Leadership/Martila & Kiley, A Study of Attitudes Among the Parents of Primary-School Children, 1995).*	• National Household Education Survey (NHES), 1999
	32. The percentage of parents who meet with teachers about their children's learning will show continuous improvement, reaching 90% by 2002.	• *71% of parents reported that they went to a regularly scheduled parent-teacher conference or meeting. (National Household Education Survey, 1996)* • *92% of schools surveyed reported that they held parent-teacher conferences, and 57% of those schools reported that most or all parents attended. (Fast Response Survey System, 1996)*	• National Household Education Survey, 1999
	33. The percentage of parents who say that the school actively encourages and facilitates family involvement will show continuous improvement.	• *Percentage of parents who agreed with the statement: "I am respected by the teachers and principals":* *—39% of 1st grade parents* *—34% of 4th grade parents* *—23% of 8th grade parents.* *(Prospects Study analysis by Abt Associates, 1995, as cited in the 1995 Goals Report)* • *Percentage of schools reporting that parent input is considered to a moderate or great extent in making decisions on school issues: allocation of funds, 39%; curriculum or overall instructional programs, 47%; discipline policies and procedures, 50%; monitoring and evaluating teachers, 5%.* *(Fast Response Survey System—Survey on Family and Schools Partner-ships in Public Schools, K-8, 1996)*	• Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1998

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	34. By 2002 the number of children participating in after-school programs will double, from 1.7 million to 3.4 million children. (Legislation needed)	• *1.7 million children. (National Study of Before & After School Programs, 1991).*	• Data source to be determined
1.6 Greater public school choice will be available to students and families.	35. By 2002, 25% of all public school students in grades 3-12 will attend a school that they or their parents have chosen.	• *12% of students. (1993)*	• National Household Education Survey, 1999
	36. By 2001 a minimum of 40 states will have charter school legislation.	• *11 states have charter school legislation. (1994)* • *26 states. (1996)* • *29 states. (August 1997).*	• Program files, annual
	37. By 2002 there will be 3,000 charter schools in operation around the nation.	• *64 charter schools. (1994-95)* • *428 charter schools. (January 1997)*	• OERI-sponsored RPP study, 1998, 1999, 2000 • Data from state legislatures and state educational agencies, annual
	38. School districts will increasingly make choice available to their students through magnet schools, charter schools, and open enrollment policies.	• *34% of districts. (1993-94)*	• Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000
1.7 Schools use advanced technology for all students and teachers to improve education.	39. Students who have access to high-quality educational technology will show improved achievement in core academic subjects and improved technological literacy.	• *Baselines to be determined.*	• National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and State NAEP assessments of reading and math, grades 4, 8, and 12 , 1998 • Technology Innovation Challenge grantees: — Annual evaluation reports from individual projects, years 2-5 of project implementation and at end of award period — Data from external program evaluator, 1998 — Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, follow-on evaluation, 1999

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	40. The ratio of students per modern multimedia computer will improve to 5:1 by 2001.	• *35:1 (Q.E.D.,Inc., 1996)*	• Advanced Telecommunications and U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements, 1997-2002
	41. The percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Information Superhighway will increase from 14% in 1996 to 25% in 1998, and higher percentages thereafter.	• *14% (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, 1996)*	• Advanced Telecommunications and U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements, 1997-2002
	42. At least 50% of teachers will integrate high-quality educational technology, high-quality software, and the Information Superhighway into their school curricula by 2001.	• *20% of teachers in 1996 use advanced telecommunications for teaching. (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey)*	• Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999 • State annual report cards (voluntary)
	43. Students in high poverty schools and students with disabilities will have access to advanced technology (including assistive technology for students with disabilities) that is comparable to that in other schools by 2001.	• *Internet access by 53% of high poverty schools, compared to 78% in low poverty schools, 1996. (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey)*	• Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements 1997-2002 • Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999
	44. At least 60% of teachers, school administrators, and school librarians will have been trained on use of computers and the Internet to help students learn, by 2001.	• *Training in advanced telecommunications mandated by school, district or teacher certification agency for 13% of teachers and 31% encouraged by incentives in 1996. (Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools)*	• Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, annual data elements, 1997-2002 • Evaluation of Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, 1997 • Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998, 1999 • State annual report cards (voluntary)

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
Goal 2. Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.			
2.1 All children enter school ready to learn.	1. Kindergarten and first grade teachers will increasingly report that their students enter school ready to learn reading and math.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, 1999 • Propose new cohort for 2003, working with NCES and the Department of Health and Human Service's Administration on Children, Youth, and Families
	2. The disparity in preschool participation rates between children from high-income families and children from low-income families will decline year by year.	• *Disparity equaled 28% in 1991. (National Household Education Survey, 1991)* • *Disparity equaled 25% in 1995. (Current Population Survey, 1995)*	• National Household Education Survey, 1999 • Current Population Survey, annual
	3. The percentage of children from birth to five years old whose parents read to them or tell them stories regularly will continually increase.	• *66% of 3- to 5-year-olds' parents read to them or tell them stories regularly. (National Household Education Survey, 1993)*	• National Household Education Survey, 1999 • Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1998
2.2 Every child reads independently by the end of the third grade.	4. Increasing percentages of fourth-graders will meet basic, proficient, and advanced levels in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).	• *60% of 4th-graders scored at or above the basic level in reading. (NAEP, 1994)*	• NAEP, biennial
	5. At least 25% of students will participate in the national reading test by spring 1999; increasing percentages thereafter will participate.	• *5 states, the Department of Defense Schools, and 15 urban school districts have signed up to implement the national voluntary test. (Department of Education records, 1997)*	• Department of Education records, 1997-2002
	6. By 2001 the America Reads Challenge corps will prepare tutors for 3 million children, including at least 100,000 college work-study tutors annually. (Legislation needed.)	• *Baseline under development.*	• America Reads program files, annual

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	7. Increasing percentages of teachers of kindergarten through third grade will complete intensive professional development to enable them to skillfully teach reading.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 • Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000
2.3 Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry.	8. More eighth-graders reach the basic level or higher levels of proficiency in math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress; on international assessments, at least 60% will score at the international average by 2002, and at least 15% will be in the top 10% by 2002.	• *61% of students scored at or above the basic level in 1996, 56% in 1992, and 51% in 1990. (National Assessment of Educational Progress—NAEP, 1996)* • *U.S. fourth-graders score above average in math compared to 26 nations in the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) fourth-grade assessment. Nine percent of U.S. fourth-graders would rank among the world's top 10% in mathematics based on the 26 TIMSS countries. (TIMSS, 1995)* • *U.S. eighth-graders score below average in math compared to the 41 nations in the TIMSS eight-grade assessment. Five percent of U.S. eighth-graders would rank among the world's top 10% in mathematics based on the 41 TIMSS countries. (TIMSS, 1995)*	• NAEP, biennial, 1998 • National Voluntary test, 1999 • Third International Mathematics and Science Study/Replication of the eighth grade (TIMSS R), 2000 (Contingent upon funding)
	9. At least 25% of students will participate in the national math test by spring 1999; increasing percentages thereafter will participate.	• *5 states, the Department of Defense Schools, and 15 urban school districts have signed up to implement the national voluntary test. (Department of Education records, 1997)*	• Department records, 1997-2002
	10. Each year, more new teachers will enter the workforce with adequate preparation to teach challenging mathematics to students in kindergarten through eighth grade.	• *The average number of undergraduate mathematics courses K-8 teachers took was 3. (Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94)*	• Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000 • Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study • States' pass rates on rigorous licensing exams, 1997-2002
	11. Each year, more teachers in grades 5-8 will complete intensive professional development to enable them to teach challenging mathematics.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 • Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999-2000

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	12. Each year, increasing numbers of schools will have access to and use information on best practices for math instruction.	• *67% of all teachers reported using curricula aligned with high standards in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996)* • *82% of all teachers reported using instructional strategies (i.e., hands-on activities, cooperative learning) aligned with high standards in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996)* • *22% of all teachers reported using innovative technologies such as the Internet and telecommunications-supported instruction in math. (Baseline Survey of Schools, 1996)*	• Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1997-99 • Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998 • Office of Education Research and Improvement: Percent of textbooks and instructional materials that independent experts consider exemplary and align with high standards, 1998
2.4 Special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards.	13. States will implement appropriate procedures for assessing and reporting progress towards achieving to high standards by students who have disabilities, are limited English proficient, or are children of migrant workers, by 2001.	• *State assessment staff report that 24 states include LEP students in testing for Title I, and 17 include students with disabilities. (ED State Implementation Survey, 1997)*	• Follow-up ED State Implementation Survey, 1999 • Title I Performance Reports, 1998-2002
	14. The number of schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum, instruction, and support services for at-risk students will increase annually.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 • Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998-1999
	15. Increasing percentages of administrators and educators working with at-risk children will have access to and use high-quality information and technical assistance on effective practices provided by Department-sponsored technical assistance and research centers as well as through professional associations and publications.	• *State officials identify oral and written federal sources of information and assistance, as well as professional associations and publications as most helpful. Districts rely most heavily on state sources, professional associations, and education publications. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field" June 1997)* • *Principals rely most often on institutes or workshops, other principals, LEAs, and state- or district-sponsored conferences for information and technical assistance. Direct support to schools from the U.S. Department of Education was uncommon. (Public School Survey on Education Reform, 1997)*	• Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies, 1998 • Follow-up State Survey, 1999; Follow-up Survey of Schools, 1997 • Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998-1999

97

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

99

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	16. Increasing percentages of teachers and other staff will be equipped with strategies to enable students with limited English proficiency or disabilities to meet challenging standards.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Data source to be determined
	17. Federal technical assistance and other support to states will result in annual increases in the number of states and local school districts with the capacity to disaggregate and report out assessment data aligned with standards for at-risk students.	• *12 states report data disaggregated by economic disadvantage, 16 by race/ethnicity, and 1 by migrant status. (State Accountability Reports, 1997)* • *12 states report fully implementing disaggregated reporting procedures. (ED State Implementation Survey, 1997)*	• Crosscutting Survey of Local Districts, 1998 • Follow-up State Survey, 1999
Goal 3. Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.			
3.1 Secondary school students get the information and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education.	1. Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students while the enrollment gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.	• *High income students enrolled in college at a rate that was 49 percentage points higher than the rate for low-income students. (Analysis of Current Population Survey, 1995)* • *White students enrolled in college at a rate that was 13 percentage points higher than the rate for black students and 11 percentage points higher than Hispanic students. (Analysis of Current Population Survey, 1995)*	• Current Population Survey, annual
	2. Increasing percentages of students age 12 through high school and their parents will have an accurate assessment of the cost of attending college and the aid available for college by 2002.	• *In 1996, the general public overestimated postsecondary tuition by $2,330 in two-year public colleges, $3,148 in four-year public universities, and $4,990 in four-year private universities. (American Council on Education survey, 1996)* • *In 1988, 11.4% of parents of 8th-graders agreed with the statement, "I do not see any way of getting enough money for my 8th-grader to go to college" and 16.5% had not thought about college costs. (Analysis of data from the 1988 National Education Longitudinal Survey)*	• A survey of middle school parents will be conducted in 1997. • No determination has yet been made regarding how data will be collected from students.

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	3. The percentage of students from age 12 through high school who are aware of the academic requirements for college or postsecondary vocational enrollment will increase annually.	• *Baseline to be determined.*	• Data source to be determined
	4. By October 2001, there will be a single point of contact that allows students to get information on federal student aid, apply for aid, and have their eligibility for aid determined within four days of electronic application, cutting in half the current processing time. (Requires approval of electronic signature.)	• *Current processing of electronic applications is approximately 8 days. (OPE program data, 1997)*	• Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) program data
3.2 Postsecondary students receive the financial aid and support services they need to enroll in and complete their educational program.	5. Unmet need (the percent of a student's total cost of education that is not met by student and family contribution and all sources of financial aid)—a measure of opportunity or access to postsecondary education—will show decreases over time, especially for low-income students.	• *In 1992-93, percent of unmet need was 30% for all students ranging from 54% for low-income independent students to 4% for upper- income dependent students. (Analysis of data from the 1992-93 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study)*	• National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, 1997 and 2001
	6. The percentage of borrowers with student loan debt repayments exceeding 10% of their income will remain stable or decline over time.	• *Among 1992-93 bachelor's degree recipients making loan payments, 31% had required payments that were 10% or more of their income. (Analysis of data from the 1994 Baccalaureate and Beyond study)*	• Baccalaureate and Beyond Study, 2001
	7. Graduation rates for all students in four-year and two-year colleges will improve, while the gap in completion rates between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority students will decrease.	• *Among students in the lowest income quartile entering college in 1990, 34% had graduated by 1994 compared to 57% of students in the highest income quartile. (Analysis of data from the 1994 Beginning Postsecondary Student study)* • *Among white students entering college in 1990, 51% had graduated by 1994 compared to 42% of black students and 45% of Hispanic students. (Analysis of data from the 1994 Beginning Postsecondary Student study)*	• Beginning Postsecondary Student study, 1998 and 2001

101

102

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	8. Participants receiving support services through the TRIO programs will enroll in and complete postsecondary programs at rates higher than comparable non-participants.	• *For low-income, first-generation college students participating in the Student Support Services program, 61% who began at two-year schools and 80% who began at four-year schools were still enrolled in college in the third year. (Student Support Services Evaluation, 1997)* • *Compared to a control group, 1992 Upward Bound participants earned about one credit (Carnegie unit) more than nonparticipants. Participants earned more credits than non-participants in science, math, English, foreign languages and social studies. (Upward Bound Evaluation, 1997)*	• Upward Bound evaluation, 1997 • Student Support Services evaluation, 1999
3.3 Postsecondary student aid delivery and program management is efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive.	9. Customer satisfaction ratings among students, parents, and postsecondary institutions participating in the student aid programs will increase to 90% by 2001.	• *In 1995-96, 79% of postsecondary institutions and 84% of borrowers participating in the FFEL program and 83% of postsecondary institutions and 85% of borrowers participating in the Direct Loan program indicated overall satisfaction with their loan program. (Direct Loan Evaluation, 1997)* • *In addition, 73% of postsecondary institutions indicated that overall they were pleased with the assistance they received from ED in managing and administering the student aid programs. (Higher Education Survey #20, 1996)*	• Direct Loan Evaluation, 1997 and 1998 • Customer Satisfaction Surveys, annual beginning in 1997
	10. The annual number of students and families submitting or renewing their federal student aid applications electronically will continue to increase each year, almost doubling to 3 million by October 2001.	• *In the 1996-97 award year, 1.7 million applications were filed electronically. (OPE program data, 1997)*	• OPE program data
	11. The accuracy and integrity of data supplied by applicants, institutions, lenders, and guaranty agencies will show continuous yearly improvements.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Analysis of National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) and other systems data

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	12. Evaluation of contracts for major OPE financial aid systems will indicate that the government and the taxpayer are receiving "better than fully successful" performance (including quality, cost control, and timeliness).	• *Baseline under development.*	• Contract performance and monitoring reports are being developed which would be completed monthly for all major contracts
	13. There will be no material internal weaknesses identified in the student aid programs' portions of the Department-wide financial statement audit; and there will be no student aid program issues that prevent ED from receiving an unqualified opinion on the financial statements.	• *No material weaknesses were identified in the Pell Grant, Campus-Based, and Direct Loan program portions of ED's 1995 department-wide financial statement audit. Three material internal control weaknesses were cited in the FFEL portion of the audit. (Financial audit, 1995)*	• Financial Statement Audits, annual
	14. The percentage of postsecondary institutions found to be in substantial compliance with federal requirements will increase each year.	• *Baseline under development.*	• OPE/Institutional Participation and Oversight Service data, annual
	15. The annual recovery rate on defaulted student loans will show continuous improvement.	• *The recovery rate—the amount collected in a given year divided by the total amount of defaulted loans available for collection—is estimated to be 7% in 1997. (OPE program data, 1997)* *(The recovery rate appears low because it divides an annual number by a cumulative one. Eventually, ED will collect 60% of the principal and interest owed on defaulted loans.)*	• OPE/Debt Collection Service data, annual
	16. The cohort default rates—the percentage of borrowers leaving school who default within two years—for the Federal Family Education Loan and the Direct Loan Program will decline to a level of 10% or less by 2002.	• *For borrowers entering repayment in FY 1990 - 1994, default rates were 22.4%, 17.8%, 15.0%, 11.6%, and 10.7 respectively, dropping by more than 52% over the five-year period. (OPE program data, FY 1990-94)*	• OPE data, annual

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	17. During 1998, the length of time to fully complete a loan consolidation application will average no more than 60-90 days; future surveys of borrowers will show that an increasing percentage of applicants for loan consolidation are highly satisfied with the timeliness and accuracy of the loan consolidation process.	• *Baseline to be determined.*	• OPE data, annual • Customer Satisfaction Surveys, annual beginning in 1997
	18. By September 1998, ED will have a complete system architecture developed for the delivery of federal student financial aid; implementing this design will improve customer service and increase control over federal costs.	• *Baseline to be determined.*	• OPE data, annual
3.4 Adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.	19. The percentage of persons who are aware of and use the Lifetime Learning tax credit will increase annually.	• *Baseline to be determined.*	• Data from Treasury Department and school surveys, annual
	20. The percentage of persons who maintain competitive employment and earnings 24 months after completion of vocational rehabilitation will increase significantly by 2002.	• *Baseline to be determined using the long-term follow up methodology currently being developed as a part of the Section 106 Standards and Indicators.* • *Baseline also available in 1998 from Vocational Rehabilitation Longitudinal Study.*	• Data to be collected periodically using methodology developed for the Section 106 Standards and Indicators • Vocational Rehabilitation Longitudinal Study, 1998
	21. In vocational rehabilitation, the percentage of all persons who obtain competitive employment after receiving vocational rehabilitation services will increase each year.	• *61% currently obtain competitive employment. (Rehabilitation Services Administration State Data, 1996)*	• Rehabilitation Services Administration state data, annual
	22. By 2002 the literacy skills of American adults will improve as shown by significantly fewer adults performing at the lowest proficiency level on national assessments.	• *Between 40 and 44 million adults performed in the lowest of five proficiency levels. (NALS, 1992)*	• National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS II), 2004

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	23. Increasing percentages of adults enrolled in beginning adult basic education programs and English as a second language programs will achieve proficiency in basic skills as measured by standardized tests.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Adult Education Management Information System and its successor, a new national data reporting system, annual • Evaluation of adult education programs
Goal 4. Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.			
4.1 Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high-quality information and products.	1. By 2001 at least 90% of customers, internal and external, will agree that ED products, services, and information, including those on the Department's web site, are of high quality, timely, and accessible.	• *On a scale of 1-5, customers favorably rated our world wide web site on: timeliness, 4.25; ease of finding information, 3.85; overall usefulness, 4.07. (Internet customer survey, 1997)* • *82% of customers overall were satisfied with publications and reports of the ED Library Statistics program; 87% of frequent users were satisfied or very satisfied; 70% reported satisfaction with timeliness. (NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey, 1996)*	• Internet customer survey, ongoing • NCES Customer Satisfaction Survey, 1997
	2. Department employees and front-line service centers will meet or exceed the Department's customer service standards by 2000.	• *71% of customers were completely or somewhat satisfied with telephone service. (ED phone survey, 1996) [Additional data on phone service and control correspondence are available.]*	• ED phone survey follow up, 1997 • Control correspondence survey follow up, 1997 • Additional surveys of customer service standards being planned
	3. Quarterly evaluation reports for the "One-Pubs" system, based on quality assurance surveillance, indicate that high standards of performance will be achieved for dissemination of ED's information products by 2000.	• *78% of publications were received within 8 days of request; 22% of publications were never received. (ED phone survey, 1996)*	• Publications contractor surveillance plan, monthly reports beginning 1998

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
4.2 Our partners have the support and flexibility they need without diminishing accountability for results.	4. Surveys of states and school districts will increasingly rate the Department's technical assistance, including assistance from the integrated reviews, as very useful in improving their performance.	• *States rate oral and written information as most helpful; the comprehensive centers are considered the least helpful form of technical assistance by state administrators of federal programs. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field," June 1997)* • *Districts rely more upon 'other' sources of information and states than the federal government for assistance. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field," June 1997)* *[Additional data are available on other forms of federal technical assistance.]*	• Follow-up State Survey, 1999 • Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies, 1998
	5. By 2002 the number of separate ED programs will decline significantly from the current 197 in FY 1997. (Requires legislative action.)	• *197 programs (Department records, 1997)*	• Review of Department records, annual, 1998-2002
	6. Customers will increasingly report that they have greater flexibility and better understanding of ED rules and requirements.	• *Most districts report reasonable or full of understanding of the new flexibility and accountability provisions in federal elementary/secondary education legislation (e.g., 85% for schoolwide programs and 52% for waivers). At the state level, states also report high levels of understanding of statutory provisions, ranging from 71% on consolidation of administrative funds to 93% on schoolwide programs. (Baseline surveys in "Reports on Reform from the Field,"September 1997)* *[Additional data are available on other flexibility and accountability provisions.]*	• Follow-up State Survey, 1999 • Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies, 1998 • Regulatory Reinvention Initiative reports • Focus groups with customers affected by regulations • Recommendations and feedback from customers
	7. New discretionary grants processed using the re-engineered grant-making process will be awarded each year on a timely basis.	• *Percent of total new grants planned that were awarded on time. (Grants and Contracts Management System, 1996)*	• Grants and Contracts Management System, 1997 • Education Central Automated Processing System, Grant Application and Payment System, 1998-2002

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	8. Reports from program monitoring teams and audit reports under the Single Audit Act will show a reduction in significant recurring findings.	• *Baseline under development. (Will be summary of audit reports from a random sampling of states, 1996)*	• Audit reports from tracking the same states sampled, annual, 1997-2000
	9. The number of states participating in the Cooperative Audit Resolution and Oversight Initiative (CAROI) will increase to meet the needs of our partners.	• *Common Audit Resolution System* *— 1995: 0 states* *— 1996: 3 states* *— 1997: 10 states*	• Common Audit Resolution System, 1997-2002
4.3 An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equity.	10. Peer reviews will increasingly show that education research and statistics supported by the Department are of high quality, are focused on critical education reform issues, and contribute significantly to educational improvement.	• *Baseline under development.* *Note: 100% of research and statistics reports are adjudicated through expert peer reviews.*	• Documentation and comments from peer reviewers, 1997-2002 • Advisory Council on Education Statistics quality assurance and feedback meetings, quarterly • Phase II Standards, expert panels for research-based programs
	11. Education research will increasingly meet the needs of our partners (e.g., states, schools, institutions of higher education) and our customers (teachers, parents, students, business) for reliable information on how to make schools more effective, as measured by biennial customer surveys.	• *The first OERI customer survey on NCES in 1996 found that:* *– 95% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the NCES flagship publications — the Digest of Education Statistics, Condition of Education, and Projections of Education Statistics.* *– 87% had used NCES data, and 41% had used NCES electronic data files.*	• Customer surveys of key customers and stakeholders • Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1999 • Specific customer surveys for ERIC, the Centers, and the Regional Labs • Regional Lab Program Evaluation
	12. In major and selected other programs, increasing percentages of grantees will demonstrate that their programs and services are based on sound research results.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Phase I standards (evaluation criteria) • Phase II standards (review by national experts, peer review) • Phase III (evaluation process)
	13. Dissemination of research and assessment findings will increasingly reach key customers and result in educational improvement.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance, 1999 • Other data sources to be determined

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
4.4 Our information technology investments are sound and used to improve impact and efficiency.	14. All major information systems needing repair will be converted to Year 2000 compliance on or before the end of 1998 (giving time for validation and testing during 1998 and 1999).	• *7 mission critical systems need repair. (Internal reporting on inventory of systems, 1997)*	• Inventory of systems being repaired, ongoing, 1997-2002 • Inventory of equipment, ongoing, 1997-2002 • Monitoring of status, ongoing, 1997-2002
	15. At least 90% of all employees will assess productivity as "significantly improved" as a result of available technology, as shown by the employee survey in 2000.	• *70% agree. (Employee Survey, 1996)*	• Employee Survey, 2000
	16. All Information Technology Investment Review Board assessments will show that major systems are mission-driven, cost-effective, consistent with our information technology architecture, and supported by performance-based contracts.	• *Baseline under development.*	• ED records • Independent evaluation data sources to be determined
	17. The data-reporting burden on the public will be reduced annually.	• *10% reduction in 1996. (Analysis of information collection forms, 1996)*	• Information collection forms, annual, 1997-2002 • Review of forms, ongoing, 1997-2002
4.5 The Department's employees are highly skilled and high-performing.	18. By 2000, 75% of ED managers will agree that staff knowledge and skills are adequate to carry out the Department's mission.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Employee Survey, 2000
	19. By 2000, 75% of employees will demonstrate the basic computer competencies identified in the Department's computer competency standards.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Employee Survey, 2000 • Departmental records on reasons for calls to the computer help line, ongoing • Additional measures to be determined

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	20. By 2000 most employees will indicate satisfaction with their work environment (e.g., physical surroundings, noise level, air quality), security, and accessibility.	• *In 1993: satisfaction with work environment was 31%; security, 39%; and accommodations for persons with disabilities, 48%; and 79% indicated their work environment affected quality of work. (Employee Survey, 1993)* • *In 1996: satisfaction with work environment, 49%; security, 50%; accommodations for persons with disabilities, 62%. (Employee Survey, 1996)*	• Employee Survey, 2000 • Planned assessment, 2000
	21. By 2000 most employees and managers will express high satisfaction with assistance on resolving employee disputes, and disputes are closed quickly and informally whenever possible.	• *29% satisfaction with grievance process. (Employee Survey, 1993)* • *29% resolved at counseling. (EEO 462 Report, 1993)* • *548 average lapsed days for formal disputes. (EEO 462 Report, 1993)*	• Planned assessment, 2000 • Tracking reports on Equal Employment Opportunity and Informal Dispute Resolution Center activities, ongoing • Just-in-time surveys
	22. Expert review of the quality of Department-sponsored employee training will show that the training is among the best in the federal government and comparable to the best in the private sector.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Evaluation study planned
	23. By 2001 at least 70% of ED employees will agree that the multi-evaluator General Performance Appraisal System (GPAS) improves individual employee performance and development and aligns employee goals with the overall mission of the Department.	• *Previous GPAS system did not serve to improve employee performance or development. (Final Report of Performance Evaluation Improvement Team)* • *47% agree they receive feedback on performance. (Employee Survey, 1993)* • *34% agree they receive guidance on career development from supervisors. (Employee Survey, 1993)* • *48% agree performance agreement reflects fit in ED. (Employee Survey, 1996)*	• GPAS Evaluation Report, October 1997 • Follow-up evaluation and/or employee survey, 2000

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
4.6 Management of our programs and services ensures financial integrity.	24. By 2000 the Education Central Automated Processing System (EDCAPS) will be fully implemented and providing assistant secretaries, the Chief Financial and Chief Information Officer, and program managers with consistent, timely, and reliable financial and program information, through an assessment by the Information Technology Investment Review Board.	• *Baseline available starting 1998.*	• Education Central Automated Processing System, 1998-2002 • Employee Survey, 2000
	25. Evaluation of contracts will indicate that better than fully successful performance, including quality, cost control, timeliness, and other factors, is being received by the government and the taxpayer.	• *Will establish the baseline with 1997 data.*	• Agency evaluations of contractor performance, annual
	26. Auditors will issue a clean opinion on the Department-wide annual financial statements every year.	• *Disclaimer on Audit Opinion. (Inspector General-contracted audit report, FY 1995)*	• Inspector General-contracted audit report, FY 1997-2002
4.7 All levels of the agency are fully performance-driven.	27. Employees will recognize the strategic plan as meaningful and understand how their work supports achieving the plan's goals and objectives.	• *In 1993: 60% of employees have a clear understanding of how the goals and strategies of their principal office support the mission of the Department. (Employee Survey, 1993)* • *In 1996: 74% of employees have a clear understanding of how the goals and strategies of their principal office support the mission of the Department. (Employee Survey, 1996)*	• Employee Survey, 2000
	28. Senior leadership and managers' reviews of performance indicator data will result in appropriate follow-up actions.	• *Baseline to be developed in FY 1997 based on the tracking system for strategic plan indicators.*	• Tracking system for strategic plan indicators, 1997-2002 • Ongoing progress reports on objectives, 1997-2002 • Employee Survey, 2000

Supplemental Information on Strategic Plan Performance Indicators

Goals and objectives	Indicators	*Illustrative baseline or related data*	Data sources and year(s) to be collected (1997-2002)
	29. Independent assessments will verify that all large and selected other ED programs have comprehensive, high quality performance measurement systems that are used for program improvement and accountability by 2000.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Department-funded assessment by a independent organization, 2000
	30. By 2000 all ED program managers will assert that the data used for their program's performance measurement are reliable and valid or have plans for improvement.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Special survey of managers, 2000 • Review of performance appraisal criteria
	31. Managers will agree that policy, budget, and resource allocation decisions are aligned with the strategic priorities of the Department.	• *Baseline under development.*	• Employee Survey, 2000

Appendix B: Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

The Government Performance and Results Act requires agency strategic plans to describe the program evaluations used in establishing and revising general goals and objectives and a schedule for future program evaluations.

The Department has an active evaluation program, national statistical and assessment studies, and grantee/institution information systems to provide information supporting the strategic plan. Our studies and surveys provide information on student progress, education system improvement, the effects of specific programs and initiatives, financial aid, and the management of the Department. We also use data from other federal agencies' studies and surveys where available.

This section describes the key studies that will inform the implementation of goals and objectives in the Department's strategic plan, including providing data for the performance indicators. The table includes the study's title, what agency sponsors it and who carries it out, the sample population, the nature of the data collected, and when the data are or will be collected. It is grouped by evaluations, statistical and national assessment studies, grantee performance systems, and other studies. Within each section, studies are listed alphabetically by title.

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
Elementary and Secondary Education Program Evaluations					
1.	**Baseline State Implementation Study (national evaluation of Title I, Goals 2000, and other K-12 programs)**	Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) Contractor: Policy Studies Associates, Inc.	Federal program directors and state research or evaluation specialists in state education agencies	Information on preliminary implementation of new provisions of state-administered Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) and Goals 2000 programs. Key issues will include standards development, assessment systems, technical assistance, and state supports for school improvement. Focus is on how legislative framework and federal resources are incorporated into the context of state school improvement efforts.	1996
2.	**Cross-cutting District Survey and Case Studies (national evaluation of local-level implementation of programs authorized under ESEA and Goals 2000, with an emphasis on Title I)**	PES Contractors: Policy Studies Associates, Inc., and Urban Institute, Inc.	District administrators of Federal ESEA and Goals 2000 programs	This study is analyzing districts' efforts to support the implementation of ESEA programs—particularly Title I, and Goals 2000 within the context of state and local reforms. Particular attention will be paid to program governance, in addition to supports for effective instruction, and family/community partnerships.	1998
3.	**District Implementation Study (baseline national survey of local district implementation of federally-supported reforms through Goals 2000 and Title I)**	PES Contractor: Urban Institute, Inc.	District administrators of Federal ESEA and Goals 2000 programs	This study collected baseline information on districts' efforts to support the implementation of ESEA programs—particularly Title I, and Goals 2000 within the context of state and local reforms.	1997

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
4.	**Follow-Up State Implementation Study (Follow-up national evaluation of Title I, Goals 2000, and Other State-Administered Elementary/Secondary Programs)**	PES	Federal program directors and state research or evaluation specialists in state education agencies	Follow-up information on implementation of new provisions of ESEA programs and Goals 2000. Focus is on how legislative framework and federal resources are incorporated into the context of state school improvement efforts. Key issues will include standards development, assessment and accountability systems, technical assistance, and state supports for school improvement.	1998
5.	**Follow-Up Survey of Schools (evaluation of standards-based reform, Title I and Goals 2000 supports for reform)**	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	Public school principals	Information on understanding and implementation of state-established content and performance standards and Title I provisions supporting use of those standards.	1997
6.	**Implementation of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act (SDFSA) Program**	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	National sample of LEAs	Information on LEA implementation of the SDFSA program, including planning, uses of funds, evaluation, and goals and objectives.	1998 (may be repeated)
7.	**Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance (evaluation of the implementation impact of IASA on changing school systems and improving student performance)**	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	80 schools in 20 moderate to high poverty school districts in 7 states	Information on the implementation of Title I's reauthorization in teaching and learning, focusing on the curriculum and instruction enacted in classrooms, on student performance as measured by a nationally uniform instrument, and on how these change over time.	Spring 1997, 1998, 1999

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
8.	**National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (evaluation of Title I in the context of standards-based reform)**	PES Contract to be awarded 9/97	School principals, teachers, parents	The national longitudinal survey of schools will examine how schools are implementing standards-driven improvements, with a particular focus on implementation of the new provisions in the Title I program supporting such improvements. The study will look at how schools use their outcome data to change classroom practice and how they measure progress continuously.	1998, 1999
9.	**National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): State Analysis**	PES	Secondary analysis of student assessment data on state assessments	Comparison of performance on NAEP to performance on state assessments.	1997
10.	**Public School Surveys on Education Reform (baseline evaluation of standards-based reform and Title I supports for reform)**	PES and NCES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	Public school principals and teachers	These two surveys collected baseline data on principals' and teachers' perceptions of systemic education reform and the extent to which reform activities are being implemented in their schools. Both principals' and teachers' surveys focused on high standards for all students and alignment of curricula, instruction, textbooks, innovative technologies, and student assessment with these high standards. They also addressed parent involvement, information needs, and effective sources of information for principals and teachers. The teachers' survey also collects initial data about professional development. The principals' survey specifically addresses changes in Title I since reauthorization.	1996

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
Postsecondary, Vocational, School-to-Work, and Adult Program Evaluations					
11.	**College Preparation Studies**	PES	Middle-grade students and their parents	Research studies are being done using the National Education Longitudinal Survey (NELS) to identify key factors affecting which eighth grade students enrolled in college within two years of expected high school graduation and which did not. In addition, a series of focus groups and a survey of middle school parents are being conducted to develop a better understanding of what information parents of middle school students want and need concerning the benefits, academic requirements, and cost of college and the availability of student aid. These studies will be used to help formulate the national campaign aimed at encouraging middle-school students and their parents to prepare for college.	Research analyses: 1996 and 1997 Surveys and focus groups: 1997 Future studies are planned for 1998
12.	**Evaluation of Effective Programs and Practices for Adult ESL Students**	PES and OVAE (Office of Vocational and Adult Education) Contractor: American Institutes for Research, Inc.	Adult participants in English as a second language programs who have low native-language literacy	Data on learning gains and persistence, and such longer-term outcomes as advancement to higher level English-language instruction, securing employment or job promotions, and removal from welfare.	1998-2000
13.	**Evaluation of Effective Adult Basic Education Programs and Practices**	PES and OVAE Contractor: Abt Associates, Inc.	Participants in low-level Adult Basic Education classes	Data on learning gains and persistence, and such longer-term outcomes as advancement to higher level literacy instruction, securing employment or job promotions, and removal from welfare.	1998-2000

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
14.	**Longitudinal Study of the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Service Program**	PES and OSERS (Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services) Contractor: Research Triangle Institute Inc.	A sample of 8,500 current and former VR consumers at 37 VR offices	Information on the characteristics of VR consumers and local VR agency offices; the impact of local economic and environmental factors on services and outcomes; and short and long-term outcomes achieved by VR consumers and their satisfaction with the program.	1994-1998
15.	**National Direct Student Loan Evaluation**	PES Contractor: Macro, Inc.	Representative samples of postsecondary institutions, students, and parents participating in the Direct Loan and Federal Family Education Loan (FFELP) programs	The evaluation centers on three major issues: (1) *Institutions' Administration of the Direct Loan Program*: The study is identifying areas where Direct Loan institutions are having problems and also on identifying and disseminating best practices. These data will be collected through mail surveys of Direct Loan institutions and site visits to schools. (2) *Borrower Understanding and Repayment Experience:* The study is surveying Direct Loan and FFEL borrowers to determine their satisfaction with their loan program as well as their knowledge and understanding of the loan origination and repayment processes. Information will be obtained through telephone surveys of Direct Loan and FFELP borrowers who are in-school as well as in-repayment. (3) *ED's Administration of the Direct Loan Program:* The study will focus on the outcomes of ED's administration rather than internal processes, with the exception of certain key areas. Outcomes will be assessed mainly through institutions' and borrowers'	Case studies annually from 1994 to 1998 Institutional surveys annually from 1995 to 1998 Borrower surveys 1996, 1997, and 1998 ED interviews annually from 1994 to 1998 Key aspects of the evaluation will be continued in future years

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
				satisfaction with ED provided information and services obtained in surveys of Direct Loan and FFELP institutions and borrowers as well as interviews of ED and other Federal Officials, and reviews of documents and reports.	
16.	**National Evaluation of School-to-Work**	PES Contractor: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR)	Surveys of 12th grade students; transcripts; follow-ups, surveys of local partnerships; case studies of eight states and 39 communities	Information on participation, high school programs of study, postsecondary enrollment and employment; STW implementation	1996-2000
17.	**Postsecondary Gatekeeping Studies**	PES	Purposive samples of postsecondary institutions, accrediting agencies, and states chosen either because of the type of instruction being provided or to identify and disseminate best practices	Several studies have been or will be conducted assessing how the gatekeeping process is functioning. Examples of these studies include: examination of state oversight practices since the 1992 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act; assessment of the standards used in accrediting Associates in Applied Sciences Degrees; exploration of the use of secondary data sources, such as unemployment insurance files, to determine employment outcomes for students attending vocationally-oriented programs; and analysis of the standards employed by accrediting associations in reviewing graduation and placement rates in proprietary institutions.	Variable depending on emerging issues
18.	**Postsecondary Customer Satisfaction Surveys**	PES and Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE)	Representative samples of postsecondary institutions and students participating in the postsecondary education programs	Surveys have been or are being conducted of postsecondary institutions satisfaction with the operation and management of the student aid programs, TRIO, and the National Student Loan Data System and student aid applicants' satisfaction with the application process.	Institutional surveys, 1995 and 1997 Applicant survey, 1997 Additional surveys will be conducted in future years

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
19.	**Postsecondary Secondary Data Analyses**	PES	Analysis of information previously collected through NCES or Census surveys or in ED administrative files	Studies attempt to assess the effectiveness of the student aid programs by analyzing a number of issues including the educational attainment of low- versus high-income students, trends in the affordability of postsecondary education, debt burden, and the distribution of aid across student characteristics.	Annual, with the type of analysis dependent on emerging policy issues and data availability
20.	**Targeted Student Aid Studies**	PES	Representative samples of specific populations who are affected by changes in legislation or policy	Small, one-time surveys of specific populations are conducted to assess the effects of major changes in student aid policy. Examples of this type of study are surveys of students affected by changes in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA) and students and institutions participating in the Federal Work-Study (FWS) program.	Study of 1992 HEA reauthorization was completed in 1997. FWS study: 1997-98 Planned study of next HEA reauthorization to begin in 1999
21.	**Title III (Higher Education Act) Performance Measurement Study**	PES Contractor: Math Tech, Inc.	Institutions participating in the Title III (Higher Education Act, HEA) program	This study is designed to develop a system of performance indicators for judging the success of the Title III programs. The four goals of the study are to: (1) define program goals in measurable terms; (2) determine how federal management activities contribute to program goals; (3) determine how institutional activities contribute to program goals; and (4) establish an annual progress report. Information to accomplish these goals will be obtained from a survey of all Title III participating institutions and case studies at between 30 and 40 selected sites.	Both the survey and case studies will be conducted in 1997

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
22.	**TRIO-Student Support Services (SSS) Evaluation**	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	A nationally representative sample of 2,900 students participating in SSS projects at 30 colleges and a control group of 2,900 students consisting both of students at the 30 SSS institutions who did not participate in the program and students at 20 matched institutions not participating in the SSS program. Case studies were conducted at the 50 schools.	Data are being collected to assesses the effects of the SSS program on college retention and graduation, GPA, and transfer behavior (from 2-year to 4-year institutions). A second and equally important focus of the evaluation is the identification of effective services and practices for program improvement.	A baseline survey was conducted in 1991-92 with a follow-up in 1994 and another planned for 1997. College transcripts were/will be collected with each survey.
23.	**TRIO-Upward Bound Evaluation**	PES Contractor: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.	A nationally representative sample of 67 Upward Bound (HEA) projects hosted by two and four year colleges, from which 2,700 eligible applicants were randomly assigned to Upward Bound or to a control group	Data are being collected to assess the effects of Upward Bound (HEA) on students' preparation for college, high school graduation, college entry and achievement. Impacts are estimated by comparing students in Upward Bound to the control group on a range of measures, including grades, course-taking, attitudes and educational expectations. Additional data will be collected to assess longer term impacts on college persistence and graduation.	A baseline survey was conducted beginning in December 1992, with follow-up surveys undertaken in 1994 and 1996, at which time high school transcripts were also collected. Future surveys will capture data on college persistence and graduation.

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
National Statistical and Assessment Studies					
24.	**Advanced Telecommunications and U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary School Survey**	National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)	National sample of U.S. elementary and secondary schools	Information on school and classroom access to Internet, local area networks, and computers.	1995, 1996, 1997, annual
25.	**Baccalaureate and Beyond (B&B)**	NCES	A representative sample of graduating college seniors. Beginning in 1992-93, every other National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) serves as the basis for a new BPS study.	Information on time to degree, teacher preparation, early careers of professionals (including teachers), debt burden, and graduate/first professional access and choice. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative and student interviews.	1992-93 cohort: follow-ups in 1994, 1997 1999-2000 cohort: follow-up in 2001
26.	**Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS)**	NCES	A representative sample of first time beginning students, including non-traditional older students and recent high school graduates. Beginning in 1989-90, every other NPSAS serves as the basis for a new BPS study.	Information on persistence, progress, and attainment from initial time of entry into postsecondary education through leaving and entering the work force. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative and student interviews.	1989-90 cohort: follow-ups in 1992 and 1994 1995-96 cohort: follow-ups in 1998 and possibly 2001

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
27.	**Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics**	Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute for Child and Human Development (NICHD)	Nationally representative sample of 3,200 zero-to-twelve-year-old children	Data on the cognitive, behavioral, and health status of 3,200 children obtained from the mother, a second caregiver, an absent parent, the teacher, the school administrator, and the child; a comprehensive accounting of parental and caregiver time inputs to children as well as other aspects of the way children and adolescents spend their time; teacher-reported time use in elementary and preschool programs; and other-than-time use measures of other resources such as the learning environment in the home.	Collected in 1997, to be released by November 1998
28.	**Common Core of Data Surveys**	NCES	Fifty states, the District of Columbia, and five outlying areas from the universe of state-level education agencies	Information on staff and students is collected at the school, local education agency or school district (LEA), and state levels. Information about revenues and expenditures also is collected at the state level, and NCES joins the Bureau of the Census in collecting school district finance data.	Annual
29.	**Current Population Survey (CPS)/ Annual Demographic Survey-March Supplement**	Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics and Department of Commerce's Bureau of the Census	Civilian noninstitutional population including persons 16 years of age and older residing in the 50 states and the District of Columbia who are not inmates of institutions (e.g., penal and mental facilities, homes for the aged), and who are not on active duty in the Armed Forces	Labor force data including income, labor force participation, and school enrollment (currently enrolled, level of school, and full time/part time status of enrollment).	1940-present, annual

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
30.	**Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)**	NCES	A sample of kindergartners from a wide variety of public and private kindergarten programs and from diverse racial-ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. One cohort will be followed longitudinally through the 5th grade. Information will be collected from the children, their parents, teachers, and school administrators.	Data on the different environments in which children live and learn—children's neighborhoods, families, schools, and classrooms.	1998-2004 Beginning in 1998, data collection will occur in the fall and spring of the kindergarten year and in the spring of first, third, and fifth grades.
31.	**High School Transcripts Studies**	NCES	High School Class of 1982, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1998.	Changes in course-taking patterns will be measured from transcripts collected for high school graduates.	1982, 1987, 1990, 1991, 1994, 1998
32.	**Monitoring the Future (MTF)**	Department of Health and Human Services' National Institute on Drug Abuse Grantee: University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research	National sample (from selected nationally representative LEAs) of 8th, 10th, and 12th grade students	National data on alcohol and drug usage and attitudes, and on victimization in schools.	Annual (12th grade since 1975; 8th and 10th grade since 1991)

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
33.	**National Longitudinal Study of Youth (NLSY)**	Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics	Six cohorts of men and women who were selected to be representative of all Americans born during a given time. Cohorts include "older men," "mature women," "young men," and "young women," and children born to women in the 1979 survey. Cohorts include persons of civilian and military backgrounds.	Information about the life and labor market experiences of six groups of men and women at different points in time. Includes basic demographic, educational and labor market data on youth (including out-of school youth).	1966-present Data collections in 1966, 1967, 1968, 1979, 1981 1986, 1990, 1994, 1995, 1997
34.	**National Longitudinal Survey of Youth: Supplement on School-to-work**	National School-to-Work Office and Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics	Nationally representative sample of 12-17 year olds; school administrator survey	NLSY has been supplemented by additional items relevant to the STW experience; i.e., participation in career majors, job shadowing, career counseling, work-site activities and participation in various STW programs.	Baseline student survey in 1997; follow up surveys annual School administrator survey in 1997
35.	**National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS)**	NCES	A representative sample of all students enrolled at any time during the year in less-than-2-year institutions, community and junior colleges, 4-year colleges, and major universities located in the United States and Puerto Rico at the undergraduate, graduate, and first-professional levels	Detailed data on all forms of student financial aid received as well as student demographics, family income, education expenses, employment, educational aspirations, parental demographic characteristics, parental support, and how students and their families meet the costs of postsecondary education. Data are collected from ED student aid administrative records, institutional records, and student and parent interviews.	1986-87, 1989-90, 1992-93, 1995-96, 1999-2000, and every fourth year thereafter

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
36.	**National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS)**	NCES Contractor for NALS 1992: Educational Testing Service, Inc. (ETS)	Adults ages 16 and over living in U.S. households, and inmates from 80 federal and state prisons	NALS 1992 assessed the literacy skills of the U.S. adult population using simulations of three kinds of literacy tasks that adults would ordinarily encounter in daily life (prose literacy, document literacy, and quantitative literacy). Other data collected included demographic characteristics, educational backgrounds, reading practices, and labor market experiences.	1992, 2002
37.	**National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP): Elementary and Secondary School Students Survey**	NCES	Students in the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades in public and private schools	Knowledge, skills, and performance of the nation's children and youth in reading, mathematics, science, writing, history, geography and other selected subjects. *Assessments in reading and mathematics are collected at least every 2 years, in science and writing at least every 4 years, and in history or geography and other selected subjects at least every 6 years.*	1969-present Selected collections: - reading, 1996, 1998, 2002 - math, 1996, 2000 - science, 1996, 2000 - writing, 1998, 2002 - history, 1994, 2001 - geography, 1994, 2001
38.	**National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS): School Crime Supplement**	Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Statistics for main survey. NCES supports the School Crime Supplement Contractor: U.S. Census Bureau	National sample of households. The School Crime Supplement sample is 10,000 12-19 year old students in NCVS households.	The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization. Each year, data are obtained from a nationally representative sample of roughly 49,000 households comprising more than 100,000 persons on the frequency, characteristics and consequences of criminal victimization in the United States. The School Crime Supplement focuses on victimization of students.	Overall survey is annual; School Crime Supplement 1989, 1995 (planned release 1997), 1999 and triennially thereafter

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
39.	**National Education Longitudinal Survey of 1988 (NELS:88)**	NCES	A representative sample of students enrolled in the eight grade in 1988. The sample was freshened in 1990 to represent all tenth-graders and 1992 to represent all twelfth-graders.	Information on high school transitions; including academic preparation, course taking, vocational education, and drop-outs; student and parent demographics; and college access and choice. Data are collected from students, parents, teachers, and school principals as well as high school transcripts.	1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, 2000
40.	**National Employer Survey**	National School-to-Work Office and U.S. Census Bureau Contractor: Wharton School	3200 employers	Information on employer involvement with schools, and school-to-work in particular, and measure the costs and benefits to employers of such involvement.	1994, 1997, 1998, 2000
41.	**National Household Education Survey (NHES)**	NCES	Households in the noninstitutionalized civilian population of the U.S	Data on high-priority education topics are collected on a rotating basis. Topics have included early childhood education, adult education, school readiness, safety and discipline, parent/family involvement in education, and adult/youth civic improvement.	1991, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1999
42.	**National Voluntary Tests in Reading and Mathematics**	ED Contract to be awarded	4th- and 8th-graders in participating areas	Knowledge, skills, and performance of the nation's children and youth in reading and mathematics.	Assessments in reading and mathematics will be collected annually, 1997-2002
43.	**Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS)**	NCES and U.S. Census Bureau	Principals and teachers; public and private schools; school districts	Demographics of the K-12 student population, varying demand for teachers in all regions of the nation, educational qualifications of school teachers and administrators, and working conditions of teachers. It is a unified set of surveys that allows linkages of data on teachers. schools, school districts, and administrators.	1987-88, 1990-91, 1993-94, 1999-2000

151

152

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
44.	**Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)**	International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement USA support: NCES and NSF	Students at three grade levels in 41 countries	TIMSS compared the performance of 500,000 students in 41 countries worldwide, including 40,000 Americans, at levels corresponding to U.S. grades 4, 8, and 12. In addition to tests and questionnaires, it included a curriculum analysis, videotaped observations of mathematics classes, and case studies of policy issues.	1995
Grantee Reporting Systems					
45.	**Adult Education National Data Reporting System**	OVAE Contract to be awarded	States and local providers	Student participation and program performance and financial data for the Adult Education State Grant program.	Annual
46.	**National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS)**	OPE	Administrative records on all students borrowing through the federal student loan program	Information on the characteristics and status of all student loan borrowers. Used both for administrative purposes—verifying defaulted loan status, student status confirmations, etc.—and research.	Constantly updated with information from postsecondary institutions, lenders, and state guarantee agencies
47.	**Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act Performance Report**	PES and OESE (Office of Elementary and Secondary Education) Contractor: Westat, Inc.	State coordinators (SEA and Governor's office) for state formula grant program	Information on program implementation, prevalence and incidence of drug and alcohol use and violence in schools, progress in achieving measurable goals and objectives.	Annual (first report due 1997)
48.	**School-to-Work State Progress Measures**	National School-to-Work Office, ED, and Department of Labor Contractor: Mathematica Policy Research Associates, Inc.	School-to-Work (STW) partnerships in states with implementation grants and all direct federal grantees	In collaboration with the national School-to-Work Office, states have led the way in defining measures of student, school, and employer participation in career awareness, career exposure, career exploration, and work-based learning activities, as well as "leveraged" funding for STW.	1996, annual

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
49.	**State annual report cards**	OESE	State educational agencies (voluntary)	Information on state educational technology plan and other activities related to the Educational Technology Challenge Fund.	1997, annual.
Other Surveys and Studies					
50.	**Advanced Placement (AP) Examination Data**	The College Board	High school students taking AP exams in public and private schools	Knowledge, skills, and performance of high school students on AP examinations.	Annual
51.	**Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education**	Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)	State education agencies	Information on state development of content standards, graduation, teacher licensure, time and attendance.	Biennial; next in 1998
52.	***Magnet Schools of America Annual Directory***	Magnet Schools of America, Inc.	Districts/schools with magnet programs nationally	Name of school, school mailing address, school phone number, district location, name of principal, grades served, type of program (whole school or program within a school), and theme type (e.g., math, performing/fine arts, Montessori).	Updated continuously
53.	***Making Standards Matter, 1997***	American Federation of Teachers	State education agencies	Information on state development of academic standards in the core subjects. Report also assesses quality of standards.	1995, 1996, 1997; annual
54.	***Setting Education Standards High Enough***	Southern Regional Education Board	Secondary analysis of student assessment data, for grades 4 & 8	Comparison of performance on NAEP to performance on state assessments.	1996
55.	**State Student Assessment Programs Database**	OERI and Council of Chief State School Officers. Grantee: North Central Regional Educational Lab (NCREL)	State education agencies	Information on state assessment systems.	1996, 1997; annual

Descriptions of Program Evaluations and Other Studies

	Study or Data Collection	Who sponsors? Contractor or grantee?	Who collected on?	What collected?	When collected? (Years collected, frequency)
56.	**States' pass rates on rigorous licensing exams**	PES Contractor: Westat, Inc.	Teachers taking the National Teacher Exam/Praxis in 50 states	Pass rates on the National Teacher Exam/Praxis.	1997-2002, annual
57.	**Textbook and Instructional Materials Analysis**	OERI Independent Expert Panel	Textbooks and instructional materials on the market	Percent of textbooks and instructional materials that independent experts consider exemplary and align with high standards.	1998

For additional copies of this plan:

- Call 1-800-USA-LEARN. *If in Washington, D.C., call 202 401-2000*
- Fax a request to 202 401-0689
- E-mail a request to: strategic_plan@ed.gov
- Download an HTML or PDF file from the Department's web site: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/StratPln98/
- For TTY, call 1-800-437-0833
- For a Braille or audio-tape version, call 202 260-9895

For questions on this plan, call Nancy Rhett on 202 401-1679.

EA028776

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

NOV 19 1997

Message to All Department of Education Employees

Subject: The Department's New Strategic Plan

I am sending a copy of the Department's five-year strategic plan to every employee in the Department today. The plan was sent to Congress on September 30, 1997, as required by the Government Performance and Results Act. As many of you know, our strategic plan was rated as among the top in the federal government by House leadership.

The strategic plan describes how the Department of Education will work to improve education for all children and adults in the U.S. Our goals, as listed in the plan, are:

Goal 1: Help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.
Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning for all children.
Goal 3: Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning.
Goal 4: Make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

The President's Call to Action priorities are included in the plan as objectives, along with additional objectives reflecting the Department's program and management responsibilities. Achieving the four goals and the objectives of this plan will require commitment and effort from everyone, but I hope you agree that they are worth striving for. The plan will succeed if it serves as a guide for the actions of everyone—not if it sits on a shelf or is used only with outsiders.

Please take a moment to look through the plan and identify objectives and strategies that relate to your work. Over the next month, I will send you more information on how we can work together to achieve these goals and objectives. Thanks for your attention and support.

Marshall S. Smith

Marshall S. Smith
Acting Deputy Secretary

160